

APR 13 '42

# THE MONTH

NOV.-DEC., 1941

Vol. CLXXVII SEVENTY-EIGHTH YEAR

No. 924

## CONTENTS

	Page
COMMENTS.....By the Editor	481
FRANCE FROM INSIDE. MAY 1940—AUGUST 1941.....By Peter Kline	497
THE PLOUGHSHARE ( <i>Verse</i> ) .....By C. M. F. G. Anderson	518
THE PEOPLE'S COUNTRY BACKGROUND.....By W. J. Blyton	519
POLISH TEACHING ON THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION By Monsignor Józef Gawlina	524
CATHOLICS AND THE B.B.C.....By John Murray	531
THREE PEACE PLANS.....By Michael de la Bedoyere	542
MISCELLANEA.....	553
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES. A Grand Duchy under the German Heel. "Black" Muenster.	
II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.	
REVIEWS.....	564
1.—Psychoanalytical Method and the Doctrine of Freud. By Roland Dalbiez. With an Introduction by E. B. Strauss. Translated by T. F. Lindsay. 2.—Michael Drayton and his Circle. By Bernard H. Newdigate. 3.—The Book of Isaiah, trans- lated from a critically revised Hebrew text, with commentary. By Reverend Edward J. Kissane, D.D., L.S.S. 4.—The Gospel for To-morrow. By the Bishop of Truro.	
SHORT NOTICES.....	573

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., LTD.

43 Albert Drive, London, S.W.19

EDITORIAL OFFICES:

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS:

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions,  
14s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.50), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

FOR MEDITATIONS AND RETREATS

## MEDITATION MANUAL

FOR

EACH DAY OF THE YEAR

(FROM THE ITALIAN OF A FATHER OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS)  
ADAPTED FOR ECCLESIASTICS, PRIESTS, RELIGIOUS, AND OTHERS

Third Edition Foolsap 8vo, 808 pp., 6s. 6d., net.

**E**ACH meditation is short but pithy. A text or passage from the Gospels forms the basis of the three points, consisting of one or two thoughts, and some practical application, and concluding with a short "affection and resolution" taken from an appropriate psalm. The Sunday's meditation is taken from the Gospel of the day. There are series of closely connected meditations, e.g., on Corpus Christi, Pentecost, the whole of Lent; and supplementary meditations on Our Blessed Lady: worked out with special care. It is written for ecclesiastics, priests, and Religious, who will find in it much to help and encourage them. Devout persons living in the world will certainly derive benefit from reading over the daily meditation, quietly pondering upon it, and so raising up both mind and heart to God.

## THE SCIENCE OF SPIRITUAL LIFE

According to the Spiritual Exercises

BY FATHER JAMES CLARE, S. J.

Third Edition (New Impression)

Demy 8vo, 8s. 6d. net.

**F**ATHER CLARE explains and enlarges upon the truths and practical conclusions which are so briefly and concisely set down by St. Ignatius in the Book of the Spiritual Exercises; and has introduced some new Meditations and Considerations on subjects of practical importance, bearing on our daily life.

In the same manner as the Holy Scriptures require to be explained to us by God-guided interpreters if they are to be of practical utility, so too must these Exercises of St. Ignatius be interpreted by competent authority both to prevent all erroneous application of them, and to ensure their being so applied to our daily life as to mould and regulate our whole interior and exterior views and conduct. It is for this reason, and to supply as far as possible for the want of such a director and instructor, that this book was written.

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, LONDON, S.W. 15





# THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXVII

NOV.—DEC., 1941

No. 924

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

### Looking Back

IT is a sad necessity that we must now look backwards over more than two years of war. And yet, when we compare our present position—in both its general and particular aspects—with that of twelve, and still more of eighteen, months ago, there are sound reasons for confidence and encouragement. To say that the Royal Navy has “lived up” to its splendid traditions, is far too faint a praise. It has swept the enemy’s surface warships from the sea, has withstood the grim challenge of plane and submarine, and has maintained its unceasing vigilance—with all the old doggedness, coolheadedness and courage. There have been losses, of course—the *Hood*, the *Glorious*, the *Ark Royal*, to say nothing of smaller craft. When the full history of this war is written, many of its most stirring chapters will be devoted to that thin line of battleships, strung out—in defence of decency and peace and order—through the Mediterranean and the North Sea, and across the North and South Atlantic Ocean. And, in these chapters, there will be not a few pages to the glory of the daughter fleets, those of Canada, Australia and India: the old lion has some sturdy cubs. The quality and morale of the British Navy have been strikingly demonstrated in the Mediterranean. Fifteen months ago, deserted by the Navy of France, it was out-tonned and out-gunned by the Italians. Taranto, Cape Matapan, and a host of smaller blows—and now the Italian vessels cling to their harbourage except when, greatly daring, they attempt the night escort of a convoy over the narrow waters between Sicily and Libya. It is highly significant—and a great tribute to our sailors—that the merchant tonnage lost by the Axis, during the period from June to October, was considerably heavier than that lost by the Allies. Yet the Allied vessels sail the seven seas, while Axis ships do little more than dash across those inconvenient Libyan straits or dart from port to port, hugging the coastline all the time, along Norwegian shores. Nor should we forget the work of the Coastal Command in helping to keep the Channel and North Sea clear of enemy ships.

Further to the West, the battle of the Atlantic now swings in our favour, and the entry into full action of the American fleet is of immense value and significance. Allied shipping losses from July to October were only a third of the total for the previous four months. Indeed, so effective has been American aid to Britain in the Atlantic that Mr. Churchill has spoken of our ability, should the need arise, to send a fleet of heavy warships for service in the Indian and Pacific Oceans. A declaration in the same Mansion House address (November 10th) brought us the welcome news we had been so long awaiting—viz., that the Royal Air Force is “at least equal in size and numbers, not to speak of quality, to the German air power.” With the exception of General Wavell’s thrust into Cyrenaica and the military operations in Syria, Iraq and Iran, the Army’s activity was till recently confined to fighting a series of rearguard actions and retreats. None the less, the armies of the Middle East have been stoutly reinforced. The position there is much improved. Only a few months back, Iraq and Iran were showing the result of Nazi permeation and intrigue : Syria was under the government of an unfriendly General Dentz, whom—it is rumoured—the Germans hoped to have nominated as successor in North Africa to General Weygand. To-day Syria, Iraq and Iran are friendly—in two cases, allied—countries. The continuance of Russian resistance in the South will make it possible to constitute a joint Anglo-Russian front in defence of the Caucasus.

### **The Home Front**

**A**T home the general morale remains very high. In fact, this high civilian morale has puzzled and depressed the Germans. Napoleon complained that the English did not know when they were defeated : throughout last winter the Germans argued that these same English did not understand when they ought to feel discouraged. Food problems are being solved to the moderate satisfaction of the public. One retains a certain scepticism of some food departments and a fairly strong conviction that the various “black market” scandals ought to have been dealt with more severely. The public would approve of even sterner penalties for this selfish profiteering at the nation’s expense. The greatest care must naturally be taken that sustaining foods do reach those who require them for the work they are doing, and that proper supplies of milk and milk foods are available for invalids and

children. Confidence in Mr. Churchill is universal, even when it does not extend to every single one of his colleagues. Criticism in the House can be most valuable : it can also be, and has occasionally been, merely captious and silly. The complaint is made that the number of volunteers for the women's auxiliary services is inadequate. Serious questions are raised by the conscription of women for war work but, if they are required urgently, then they must give their help, and the other questions will have to be tackled in another and a straightforward way. With Lord Beaverbrook's drive for waste paper and the general paper shortage, it is curious that our walls should be disfigured with so-called "Anglo-Soviet," and obviously Communist, notices, advertising meetings and clamouring for a Western front. The war strategy must be left to those in due authority : this facile talk about a Western front is pointless when it is not thoroughly mischievous. We have full admiration for the magnificent resistance of the Russian armies and people in the face of Nazi invasion : but it is well to remind our native Communists that the war would have been over long ago, had the Russians constituted a second anti-Nazi front in May, 1940, instead of a second pro-German front against the Poles in September, 1939. The war would probably have been averted altogether, if the Russians had not signed that fatal Pact of August, 1939. Our Communists of Great Britain have served the purposes of the enemy since the pact was signed till the very day on which Hitler elected to attack Soviet Russia. Their opinions may have altered but they have not altered for any specifically British motive. And so, while we recognize—and indeed, *because* we recognize—the heroic Russian efforts in defence of their hearths and homes, we retain every single one of our suspicions of these unsound elements in our own country which, for two years of war, did whatever they could to hinder our defence of home and hearth. But there is one encouraging factor in all this, namely the completely sane and firm stand taken against such impostors by all true representatives of British Labour.

### **Terrorism in France**

**I**T is not always understood how different is Germany's Eastern face from that which she normally tries to display in the West. An article later in this number explains how the Germans at first adopted a very-correct attitude in France. Had they succeeded in keeping it up and had they released the

French prisoners of war, they might have prevailed upon the French to accept their victory as a *fait accompli*. But the pose of correctness has long since disappeared. A hundred perfectly innocent citizens of Bordeaux and Nantes, against whom even the Gestapo did not pretend to furnish accusations, have been murdered by the express order of General von Stülpnagel. An outburst of horror throughout the civilized world has stayed the Nazi hand from further massacres. For more victims were to have been sacrificed. The Germans hesitated, suddenly made aware—as though out of a world of decency with which they have lost all contact—of the loathing and detestation they had provoked. But how sickening was the fawning announcement of the Vichy news service! This informed the world that the German Führer had graciously consented to hold his hand and to postpone the killing of further hostages. That Frenchmen can stoop to lick a murderer's hand, is a sure sign how low some of them have sunk—in national consciousness and the most elementary self-respect. It is as though it were reported in some local press that Mr. Smith had graciously agreed not to throttle his wife and daughters. “On a honte d'être française”—this was the frequent avowal of Frenchwomen after the *débâcle* of 1940. One should have *honte* to be the kind of Frenchman that can compose and utter such a statement for the radio, in Vichy or anywhere else. These crimes against defenceless citizens are far more revolting than German brutality employed in direct military attack. And, it must be recalled, they will bring a frightful retribution. The Nazi methods were based upon the supposition of a complete German victory. It mattered not how many millions were oppressed, how many thousands might be tortured, maimed or murdered. There was to be no awakening of the injured and outraged peoples. Let us be just to the Nazi leaders. They expect, in the event of defeat, a most terrible punishment. They have provoked it, they have merited it—for themselves and, unfortunately, for their own nation they have so effectively misled. They now inform these misguided Germans that a defeat of Germany means Germany's annihilation. They may be right. They will be right, unless some means can be discovered to intercept the terrible popular vengeance that will fall on every German who is caught by those many European peoples, whom they have so shockingly mishandled. This is a grim fact that has to be faced. There is gathering, day by day, a storm of hatred throughout Europe, a storm that will

one day burst over the German people's heads. It is a storm, the like of which has scarcely ever existed in human history : for scarcely ever in human history has one people treated other peoples with the like barbarity and savagery. The passive, sullen opposition that is being conducted in all occupied countries, is feeding and fanning a hidden flame of vengeance which, when it finally appears, will devour swiftly and indiscriminately and ruthlessly. Can this popular vengeance be stayed and stemmed? There is just one possibility. Those responsible for the cruelties of these war years must be delivered up for trial and punishment. It will have to be done at once : and the German people should be the first to recognize its necessity and justice. Otherwise, where will you discover the lightning conductor to avert the dreadful consequences of this storm? Mr. Churchill has declared that such punishment is part of the Allies' war intentions. He is a wiser physician than many realize.

### **Magnificent Poland**

**T**HE Poles continue to suffer, as few European peoples have suffered before, as the Poles themselves—throughout their fiercely chequered history—have never suffered. A deliberate attempt is being made to degrade them as a nation, to break their spiritual resistance and morale. There have been mass deportations from Western Poland. The number of those forcibly removed from their homes amounts to more than a million and a half: and they have been moved in conditions of utter inhumanity. In spite of a large influx of Baltic Germans, the population of Gdynia has declined from 130,000 to 20,000. From Poznań 20,000 Polish families (about 100,000 individuals) have been deported, out of a pre-war population of some 300,000. War has been waged against Polish culture. All universities and secondary schools are closed. Just two years ago, 170 professors of Cracow university were arrested and sent to the notorious concentration camp of Oranienburg. And this university was established as long ago as 1364. It was the cradle of Polish culture. Art collections, museums and libraries have been pillaged : no Polish books may be published : out of the 2,000 papers and periodicals that appeared in Western and Central Poland before 1939, no single one is produced to-day, with the sole exception of three German journals issued in Polish speech. In the "General Gouvernement" into which the Poles from Centre and West have been

herded, they may still possess property but the authorities have the power to dispossess them at will. And, in any case, this narrow territory is desperately overcrowded; hunger is rife; hundreds of thousands of the younger men have been transferred to Germany to work for the *Herrenvolk*. Recent reports from this martyred country testify to a remarkable development of religion. There are communities of saints, enduring and living through all this. Everywhere passive resistance is in evidence. From secret printing presses come news-sheets that circulate from hand to hand; much of the information is from B.B.C. broadcasts. And yet, despite their agony, there are no quislings in Poland. Poland is the one country that has produced neither traitor nor quisling: there is no accommodating government in Poland because there are no accommodating Poles. May we reiterate what we have stated on not a few previous occasions? However far this war may have moved from its initial stages, the test of sincerity in victory is a very simple one; it can be summed up in one simple phrase: full justice for Poland.

### A Warning

ONE war-time temptation is that of thinking too much in the enemy's terms. We were compelled to invoke Might in the defence of Right, and now we may discover that we are thinking exclusively, like the enemy, in terms of Might. It may be necessary to employ force to resist and prevail over force, but this means too frequently that, in the end, it is force, and force alone, that imposes the conditions of peace. A similar temptation can arise from our unconscious copying of the German notions of *Lebensraum* and the "New Order." Rejecting and exorcizing this horrid Nazi dream, we may find ourselves dreaming on the same lines, of *blocs* and spheres of influence, and the rest of it. That there must and will be a new order after the war, is sufficiently obvious: and it is every bit as clear that the European peoples cannot settle down again into their relative pre-war isolation, separated one from another. Closer links must be forged, indeed are being forged in the twin furnaces of exile and tribulation: and there must be some form of international co-operation that will be strong enough to insist upon and to secure peace. The Versailles emphasis upon self-determination for all countries must inevitably be softened. Mechanized warfare has made the position of such smaller countries more impossible, in isolation,

than ever. From the economic point of view, a victorious British Commonwealth and United States will have great responsibilities and equally great authority, and Russia will necessarily be associated with them. The danger is that each of these great Powers will think in a non-European way, and Russia, if still Soviet Russia and not de-Bolshevized through war, will be definitely un-European and anti-European. This is why we view, with some concern, the general statements, that occasionally trickle into the Press, to the effect that Russia should enjoy a hegemony over Eastern and possibly Central Europe. Russia can preach no gospel of *Lebensraum* since she has at her disposal one sixth of the world's land surface. The Poles have elected to fight with Soviet Russia against the people they consider to be their greater and more dangerous foe. But they mistrust the Russians and, above all, they mistrust the Kremlin, with all its works and ways. It is essential that we regain our awareness of Europe and its special needs and problems : for, without this awareness, we shall be tempted to frame an Oceanic—and perhaps also a semi-Asiatic—peace settlement that cannot permanently survive. This is why the news is so gratifying that now Poland, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia and Greece have declared their purpose of living, after the war, in a close and federal union, and of inviting the further co-operation of Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria. That way lies sanity, that way can be re-discovered the only solution of the many vexed and acute problems, racial and economic, of South-Eastern and East-Central Europe.

### Nazi Partners in Europe

WE should be chary of a too wholesale condemnation of those smaller countries which the misfortunes of war have ranged alongside the Nazis in their attack upon Russia. Our memories can be conveniently short. Less than two years ago, we were saluting the gallant resistance of the Finns. It was an epic resistance, and this verdict stands. Mannerheim was then a name to conjure with. Finland was compelled to make peace, and it was well understood that this had been done under German pressure. What was not so clear then was the fact that the Finns had been given assurances that the anti-Russian campaign would be renewed at the German pleasure. That the Finns should seize this opportunity to recover their lost territory, is not so strange ; particularly

when one recalls the German assistance afforded to them towards the close of the last war. Where they are foolish, is in their endeavour to secure even more territory and to remain allies of the Nazis in the hope that some spoils of victory might be thrown to them. It should be remembered, also, that the Nazi pretension that they are fighting a semi-Crusade against Bolshevism, did evoke sensible echoes in Finland and Sweden. The Finns, however, are stupid not to have grasped the chance of concluding peace, under an American aegis—especially as it appears that Finland is not an “occupied” country, like Hungary or even Italy. The Finns retain a large degree of initiative. Hungary is in an awkward and delicate situation. In their difficulties with Austria during the later nineteenth century, the Hungarians were inclined to look to Prussia for sympathy and encouragement : and they have always admired the efficiency of the Prussian war machine. Nazi anti-Semitism makes some appeal to them, on account of their social and economic circumstances. And twenty years have not quite obliterated the dreadful memories of the Bela Kun Bolshevik régime. It is important not to forget the instinctive anti-Bolshevik feeling in the countries that border or nearly border Soviet Russia. Rumania merits less sympathy, even if the Russians were permitted by Germany to take back Bessarabia. The Rumanians have enlarged their territories since the beginning of the century, by something over 100 per cent : their neighbours naturally contest some of their claims. They are an unmilitary folk and have therefore been the more readily dragooned into playing the Nazi game. Bulgaria is not yet at war with Russia but well-established reports suggest that her criminal responsibility is already greater even than that of these active participants. The behaviour of Bulgarians in those portions of Greece placed under their control by the Germans, has been particularly revolting. During the past six months, about 100,000 Greeks have been expelled from their homes—in Western Thrace and Eastern Macedonia—to make room for specially imported Bulgars. Greek man power in these districts has been forcibly mobilized for agricultural labour : Greek schools are closed and the Greek language outlawed—in Greece itself. Attacks have been made against the Greek Orthodox Church ; the Metropolitans of Komotini and Alexandropolis have been removed from their sees and deported to Salonika. Of these satellite States along the Danube and in the Balkans Bulgaria has shown itself the aptest

and most brutal pupil of its evil masters. The Bulgars will not, however, let themselves be drawn into war with Russia easily. The feeling of the Bulgarian peasant for his big Slav brother in Russia is strong : and there existed in the country noticeable sympathies with Communism. But they might well be pushed into an adventure against the Turks.

### **Puzzles in the United States**

IT was bewildering to read of threatened strikes—and on a nation-wide scale—in the United States, particularly when the American President has warned his people of the serious dangers to which they are exposed, from Japan and from Europe. One was tempted to suspect Nazi sabotage. It may indeed exist. But it would not be the whole story. Many Americans refuse to accept the diagnosis given them by Mr. Roosevelt ; they persist in believing that he is leading them, dangerously and unnecessarily, into war. There is no doubt that three thousand miles of ocean lend the proverbial enchantment to the view. Mr. John Lewis, who has been the centre of this storm, is an isolationist. It must be remembered that social legislation and trade union organization are of more recent growth in the United States than in Britain : one consequence of this is that Labour's sense of responsibility there is less advanced than here. The Nazi attack on Soviet Russia had raised serious questions in the United States : unreasonably perhaps, had they considered the real situation and reminded themselves that this was in no sense an ideological or religious attack but just the violence of an aggressor that has invaded the lands of nine or ten other peoples. Our American contemporary, *The Catholic World*, adopts the attitude which opposes all American aid for, or contact with, Russia. Such aid was recently characterized as a "Covenant with Hell." There has indeed been Hell in Russia ; and Hell is loose to-day in Czechoslovakia, the Balkans and the Low Countries, but it is the Nazis, not the Bolsheviks, who have loosed it. Surely the Polish attitude ought to call for some quiet reflection. The Poles are willing to co-operate with Soviet Russia ; they will never co-operate with the Nazis. There still lingers a widespread American feeling that their intervention in the last war proved unavailing. But was it not American idealism, unbacked by practical American support, that led the people of Europe—partially at least—into the impasse of the between-

war years? The American refusal to associate their country with Great Britain in a joint guarantee of security to France must certainly be counted among the reasons for France's collapse in 1940. In making these remarks, we are in no wise qualifying our respect and admiration for Mr. Roosevelt—and indeed the great majority of the American people—who have come to understand the true character of the present struggle.

### **Japan at the Crossroads**

**J**APAN has been, officially at least, so long "at the crossroads" that one was beginning to regard this as a fixed and permanent address. The situation in the Pacific is undoubtedly serious. To judge from the tone and contents of speeches made lately in Japan, there are scanty hopes for any betterment in Washington-Tokio relations. No one denies that the Japanese have grave economic problems to contend with. But, at the same time, they have embarked on a policy of aggressiveness that has alienated British and American sympathies. A note of hysteria can be detected in the resolution passed on November 18th by the Tokio House of Representatives. This declared that the chief obstacle to a settlement of what the Japanese persist in terming "the China incident" is the opposition of foreign Powers, led by the United States: it went on to make the ridiculous statement that the main factor behind this war between Axis and Allies was "the inordinate desire of the United States for world hegemony." The resolution looks like a typical piece of propaganda, designed to convince the Japanese that their security is being threatened from the U.S.A. There is an echo of Hitler in the claim that Japanese patience and self-restraint have their limit. General Tojo's emphasis upon national unity may well conceal considerable anxiety and uncertainty about future developments and plans. It seems that the Japanese government was ready to intervene in Siberia in the event of a decisive German victory against Russia. That victory has not been achieved: and the approach of winter excludes—for the time being—any Japanese operations in that area. It is not easy to see in what direction the Japanese would move, should they make the irrevocable decision. They can scarcely attack the United States though they might assail the Philippines or American bases in the Pacific. It is likely that they are waiting to observe

how far the new British offensive in North Africa will call upon the resources of the Royal Navy. Their most likely move would be to renew, on a bigger scale, the offensive in China or to launch a campaign from Indo-China, with auxiliary attacks from the sea. From one important point of view—and it is the one and only point of view that bothers the Japanese—they would seem to have missed their most favourable opportunity. A year ago, they could have struck with far less opposition than they would meet to-day. One may dislike Mr. Chamberlain's very ill-timed reference to missing a bus, but there are grounds for applying it to Japan. The Japanese are looking well before any possible leap. They are shrewd enough to know that the consequences for themselves may be disastrous. Like Nazi Germany, Japan has "encircled" itself: for varying reasons Britain, the U.S.A., Russia and China have been converted into enemies. Japan was the first major Power to embark deliberately on a policy of aggression, after the war of 1914-18. Violence has an inexorable logic of its own, that drives the aggressor onwards from war to war, from one crime to another, to eventual defeat and—it may well be—doom. An Allied victory will certainly put an end to Japan's designs for what is ingenuously termed a "Co-prosperity Sphere" in the Far East. And, if that victory is over Japan as well as Germany, Japan's position and prestige in the Pacific and the further East will be radically altered.

### **The Japanese in China**

WHILE these comments were being prepared, there arrived a package from Chungking, the capital of Marshal Chiang Kai-Shek. The package contained a book entitled "China through Catholic Eyes": it described the vast changes that are being made throughout China during its Japanese war. "Insensibly," the book declares, "there has grown up in Western countries a new respect, a feeling almost of reverence, for this great people of China, that quietly, resolutely, but with a determination of steel, has decided that, come what may, it will not be conquered. Western nations have determined that even if it means a complete change of their way of living, they will fight through to victory; China too, almost from the first moment of hostilities, realized that a total change had to be made. It is making it, with that silent deliberation which characterizes all

the movements of its people, and amidst the war, the new China is arising. When the war is over, be it long or short, China will emerge a new nation, strong and resolute, but desiring only peace, and quite possibly the greatest force for peace among all the nations of the world." The Japanese have created Chinese nationalism much as the English in the late Middle Ages created that of France. As regards the actual "occupation" of Chinese provinces, an investigation made earlier this year reveals some remarkable figures. Of 1,500 Chinese regions, nearly two-thirds have never been affected by the invasion. Of the remaining third nearly 80 per cent. were still, entirely or for the most part, under Chinese administration, while the number of regions in which the Japanese had assumed full control, was only 50. Sixty per cent. of the population was living in uninvaded China: just over thirty per cent. were in the nominally "occupied" provinces but were free from the enemy's direct or indirect rule: slightly under ten per cent. (about 40,000,000 people) existed under Japanese administration. Details of the "occupation" show that it is frequently ineffective and highly sketchy. The Northern province of Hopei is under stricter Japanese control than any other, owing to its proximity to Manchukuo and because of Japanese infiltration before the war: yet there is a large organized Chinese army operating throughout its various districts. There is continuous interference with means of communication. As fast as the invaders establish roads and railways, the former are obliterated, the latter destroyed. In these provinces that are said to be effectively "occupied" the Japanese troops have to keep to certain towns and well-garrisoned centres since the countryside is often in Chinese hands. The district of southern Kiangsu includes Nanking, the seat of the puppet government. But close to this capital there are wide stretches with their local Chinese government in full swing whose only contact with Chungking is by radio. Schools are open, the law courts function as before. The Japanese are naturally doing whatever they can to harness China's natural resources to their own military machine; they have taken over, confiscated and pillaged. In the realm of culture, they are attempting to persuade the Chinese that they are China's sincere friends. They have established philo-Japanese training schools, youth movements, farmers' guilds and Labour Unions, the primary object of which is to develop friendship between Japanese and Chinese. The Press is in

Nippon hands, and efforts are being directed to fostering an anti-white and anti-European sentiment throughout the "occupied" territories. The Japanese are highly imitative people, and their model is obviously Nazi Germany : they are, in fact, the Prussians of the East, and to-day they appear remarkably like an oriental variety of the Nazi. But except when they can gain their point by sheer force, their efforts seem, for them, highly unsuccessful. As Dr. Wellington Koo told us recently, the Chinese are offering a total resistance to Japan's total aggression.

### **This Question of Co-operation**

**I**N a University sermon, preached at Cambridge on October 26th, Dr. Bell, the Bishop of Chichester, laid down some quite valuable principles for co-operation between non-Catholics and Catholics here in England. The tone of his address was admirable. After referring to the impetus given by the last war to a movement for closer association between Anglicans and Free Churchmen, he spoke of a similar encouragement, under the stress of to-day's crisis, to ourselves. The Catholics in England, he assured his audience, "are showing themselves ready, in quite a new way, to co-operate with members of the Church of England and of the Free Churches, in the defence of a Christian civilization." Mention was made of the now famous and familiar Joint Letter and of the many public meetings that have been held up and down the country by members of the Catholic Church and Anglicans and Free Churchmen. "We may hope"—was the preacher's sincere wish—"that such a collaboration, thus auspiciously begun, may develop in such a way as to unite all Christians in England in a common crusade for the recovery of the Christian faith in Britain, the restoration of spiritual order, and the building up of a Christian civilization." Dr. Bell was not speaking in a vague and general manner. For he anticipated at once the objections that might spring to our minds. Some Catholics, he admits, are shy of joint action, in case it should be taken to imply the countenance by Catholics "of forms of worship and ministry which, to them, are heretical." Anglicans are equally shy of co-operation with Free Churchmen, "in case it should be assumed to be the preliminary to intercommunion." And then there is still widespread fear and distrust of ourselves—that legacy of a distorted English history. After outlining these

psychological attitudes and paying a tribute to the expression of liberty of conscience, expressed in the encyclicals "Immortale Dei" (1885) and "Mit Brennender Sorge" (1937) as well as in the Constitution of Eire (1937), he went on to examine the basis of effective co-operation between ourselves and the various non-Catholic religious bodies.

### Christian Action

DR. BELL began by stating what co-operation is not and, in present circumstances, could not be. "On the negative side, everything to do with principles of Church order and credal doctrines must be definitely excluded." This is, of course, vital but it is also generous. No question, therefore—the address continued—ought to be raised about "any Church's attitude to another Church's ministry or worship, or creed, exchange of pulpits or intercommunion. All these things belong to another plane and, when discussed, should be discussed in relation to the quite different field of organic unity". Catholics do not need reminding how fixed and firm their own attitude is, and inevitably must be, on questions of this sort. That is not the matter under consideration. Given a common agreement to place co-operation, not on the field of doctrine and belief, but on the application to public life of what we know as the Natural Law and the general standards and principles of natural justice, there is surely no reason why all those who accept that Law and those principles, should not work together to insist that they be an integral part of any post-war reconstruction, whether social or international. Dr. Bell accepts the Papal Peace points, in fact he had done much to publicize them in England, and he pays tribute to Cardinal Hinsley by quoting his statement at the first of the two Stoll meetings in May last, at which, incidentally, Dr. Bell delivered an admirable address. "Though we differ on important matters" so spoke the Cardinal—"we do all maintain the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God, in the charity of Christ." This university sermon concluded with three suggestions. The first is that this collaboration must be not only an occasional demonstration, but a reality everywhere. But he would move slowly in order to move surely. In the second place, this movement for collaboration should be predominantly a lay one. The chief reason for this is that such collaboration is in the civil order. Finally, he urged the recovery of faith.

"Western civilization is derived from Christianity. Without Christian faith it is doomed." Here we agree, and must put further questions. What is this Christian faith? This remains the challenging question. Where is it to be discovered? Dr. Bell would be the last to object to this searching demand. We have our faith and our own certain answer. We are in such sympathy with what he says that, in sheer honesty, we must take the problem further. Where is that faith to be found? In the application to public life of that basis of Natural Law and justice we can act together: and the many large and enthusiastic meetings, held this year under the auspices of local Christian Councils or the Sword of the Spirit have shown that there is a real and genuine call for such an application.

### Christmas

**S**HORTLY after these lines appear in print, Christmas will be drawing near. From thoughts of war and campaigns and aggression our minds must turn—with a certain misgiving and a sense of human shame—to the Christmas message of joy and peace. "Glory to God on high—and on earth peace to men of good will": it is a sharp and severe commentary on the condition of the world. A want of peace, because men have refused to offer their meed of glory and worship to their Creator, and because the good will necessary for such peace is so utterly lacking. And yet it could be argued that, for all our materialism and short-sightedness, it is not we who have willed this war and brought misery and destitution to countless persons throughout the Continent. On the contrary, and quite humanly speaking, all hopes for the kind of peace that will be founded upon good will and on the recognition of mutual responsibility and friendliness between all peoples, are bound up with our, and an Allied, triumph. Last year even the Nazis claimed that they had been affected by the Christmas spirit: neither in the air nor on the air had they been aggressive for more than forty-eight hours, that is to say, they had neither bombed from the skies nor ranted on the radio. In other words, the Christmas spirit had hung like a gentle reminder of nobler ideals over that land which they are rapidly trying to de-Christianize. The Christmas spirit is not, however, a dimly religious setting for just two days: it must permeate our whole consciousness, even in the midst of war, and make us ever more forcibly aware that it is our bounden duty to prepare now—by

active prayer, by study and the use of influence, whatever it may be, and wherever it can be exercised—for the coming of a peace and a post-war world, in which the Law of God and Christ will be recognized and accepted. It is never enough to concentrate all energies on winning the war, only to sink back afterwards, weary and without idea or inspiration, leaving the post-war settlement to chance and opportunism. Such a reaction is certain to come : we have now to be ready for it, to prepare a counter-reaction to that reaction.

**“ THE MONTH ” and 1942**

**I**N the December issue of last year we had to announce that the MONTH would appear as a bi-monthly, in 1941 and presumably for the duration of the war. There were the two alternatives : either a monthly number, reduced to half its size, or a bi-monthly, of the pre-war size and format. Advice was taken, and it was generally agreed that the second alternative was preferable. Incidentally, there was one earlier period—from the beginning of 1871 to the end of 1873—when the MONTH was relatively untrue to its title and was published only six times a year. This was in the MONTH's youthful days, a few years after its first appearance in July, 1864. In 1942 we shall continue the practice followed this year. There has been paper shortage and serious printing delays : these are inevitable, especially since the Manresa Press fell a victim to enemy raiders sixteen months ago. Together with our sincere Christmas greetings to all our readers, we would like to express our heartfelt thanks for the support they have given us throughout this year : and at the same time we ask them earnestly to continue their much appreciated support. Conscious of the MONTH's long record of modest service in the cause of the Church, we are endeavouring to continue that service and to serve this country too in time of real need. Your help and encouragement will enable us to do this more easily and faithfully. And may we add just this final word. Those who have so loyally sent subscriptions to “ THE MONTH Forwarding Scheme ” in favour of missionaries, working overseas, are asked, wherever it is humanly possible, to continue those subscriptions. MONTH copies reach the missionaries with some delay, it is true, but, on the whole, with remarkable regularity. Letters still arrive, to tell us how much this kindly present is appreciated. May the Christmas blessing of charity and peace be with you all !

## FRANCE FROM INSIDE

MAY 1940—AUGUST 1941

"Ah," he cried in exasperation, "that is the English all over. You never recognize a revolution when you see one."—Charles Morgan, *The Fountain*.

THIS article gives the personal impressions and reflections of an Englishman who remained in France after the defeat and armistice, up to early August 1941. The more recent impressions are chiefly of the "unoccupied" zone. While I was there I tried to look at things as far as possible from the Christian and more specifically the Catholic angle: I shall try to do the same now. I also tried hard to help French friends and acquaintances towards at least some appreciation of British points of view, even where there was small hope of agreement. It seems to me equally useful to help English people towards some measure of understanding of present attitudes and opinions in France.

For one of the things that has struck me most in twelve weeks' stay in England has been the general bewilderment in face of France's present "policy" and attitude to Britain. Questions asked, even by supposedly well-informed men, shew a strange degree of ignorance of the real situation; even when they are not so startlingly naïve as the airman's query—and he was not an unintelligent man—: "Is it true that [in the French Army] all the officers were Fascists and all the men anti-Fascist?" Certainly, assimilation of a fresh and complex situation means painful work even for the least indolent of minds. Too many have taken the easy way out, the way of false analogy, which has led them into a deepening confusion of perception. They should be warned by the fact that Vichy journalists are much addicted to this method of ignoring the truth. History in fact never repeats itself.<sup>1</sup> It is precisely because he is blind to the differences between the late nineteenth century and the mid-twentieth that Cardinal Baudrillart can express himself in touching good faith as follows: "Prêtre et Français, comment, dans un moment aussi décisif,

<sup>1</sup> France in 1870, for example, though disunited as always, was at least all in one piece; she had no alternative but to treat with the enemy; the quarrel was strictly a quarrel between two Powers, and she had no allies nor awkward engagements to make the inevitable submission doubly humiliating. The Prussians, having for the moment no other enemy to crush or dread, were free—as they were not in 1940—to tolerate and even foster civil strife in the occupied country. And then, seventy years ago, it was not yet madness to sign an armistice or a peace.

refuserais-je d'approuver la noble entreprise commune dirigée par l'Allemagne, susceptible de délivrer la Russie de la gangue qui, depuis vingt-cinq ans, tient enserré, étouffé, son vieux fond humain et chrétien, de délivrer la France, l'Europe, le monde, des chimères les plus pernicieuses et les plus sangui- naires qu'ait connues l'humanité, de soulever les peuples au- dessus de leurs intérêts étroits et d'établir entre eux une sainte fraternité renouvelée du moyen âge chrétien ?" This menace of France's half-acceptance or at any rate tolerance of the " holy brotherhood " of the Nazis makes the darkness of any previous disaster in her history seem no more than a passing shadow. " Indeed," as Newman, with so much less cause, exclaimed to Hopkins in 1870, " who cannot be in distress about France ? " <sup>1</sup>

However, let us be in distress about what actually exists and what is truly distressing. It is rash to presume that what distresses certain Frenchmen in America or even in the en- tourage of General de Gaulle is necessarily painful to French- men in France—or need be painful to an Englishman. Such presumptions can have fatal effects on our propaganda and on the future of Europe. It may be true that propaganda is a sharp weapon, that it will often produce its best results when it jolts and jerks men's minds from illusion and hypnosis to live- lier awareness of reality. The sharpest weapon is useless, however, if it is not adapted to its target. As Sir Bernard Pares has remarked, writing of our shallow and tardy appreciations of foreign situations, " We are constantly missing the bus. . . . We are often dealing with a situation which has changed radically—with the last thing but one. And yet we are now fighting for Poland and Czechoslovakia and for a ' righteous peace ', which will involve the proper solution of all sorts of remote controversies." <sup>2</sup> Unless you have some sympathy with your listeners and some understanding of their outlook, your propaganda will not enter their minds at all. The finer men of any nation will always be ready to gulp down the medicine of truth : but not if it is presented in such a way that it seems to them plain poison. Even if one could be sure of a sympathetic response from a fighting minority to this or that line of propaganda, the antagonizing of the majority would be too great a price to pay for it. War, and all the means of war, have as their end the establishment of peace. A victory gained by methods that, by creating a new enemy, will have

<sup>1</sup> "Further Letters of Gerald Manley Hopkins," p. 261.

<sup>2</sup> Russia, pp. 218-219 (Penguin Special, 1940).

voided the peace even before it is signed, will be no victory at all.

Now the strongest impression I have retained of France during the past eighteen months has been one of a great change of outlook. "Revolution", if you like: but revolution in the profound sense of a silent and irrevocable turning of men's minds; a true *révolution nationale*, distinct from the pitiable juggling of Vichy, and often as much opposed to it as to the immediate past. It is for this reason that propaganda based on points of view that were dominant in France in 1939 has little appeal for and tends only to infuriate people living in France in 1941—much as anything said to us now (by an American isolationist, for example) from what was our common standpoint in 1935 would merely irritate us.

This change of outlook can be partly indicated by recalling the forces that went to mould the situation of summer, 1940, by outlining subsequent developments of opinion in the two zones, and by suggesting some reasons for the widespread tribute of loyalty still paid to Marshal Pétain. One will then be in a position to assess more readily the permanent significance of the two "revolutions", and, finally, to consider shortly the present psychological temper of France, and some possible lines of friendly attack and reassurance.

The kaleidoscopic shift and whirl of successive French cabinets, which culminated in the over-precipitate, unsettling zeal for social reform of the Popular Front, accompanied by the gravest civil disorders and a rapid decline of patriotic sentiment among the masses, had left wounds and disease in the body politic of France that were not to be healed by two years' slightly firmer handling under Daladier. (It is hard to see how in any case the soundest possible nursing throughout all those twenty years could have cured France of that pernicious anaemia, social and moral, which the slaughter of so many hundreds of thousands of her best men had brought upon her.) The most profound element of weakness, throughout the first third and more of the century, was certainly the growth of irreligion and laicism, and an increasing abandonment of the Absolute. Now a man cannot willingly lay down his life, whether he realize it or not, for anything less than an Absolute. In September 1939, the state of the country was still so uncertain that its leaders did not dare to put the question of war or Poland's betrayal to the vote of the Deputies; and war was declared unconstitutionally. In the first eight months,

every effort was made (consciously or unconsciously) to extinguish what fighting spirit there was in the French Army,<sup>1</sup> while military and administrative inefficiency, as well as Communist sabotage and other forms of treason, slowed down the production of arms and munitions in the factories. At the opening of France's battle, only about 15 per cent. of the inadequate number of planes she possessed had been produced since the declaration of war. At this stage it seemed too much to expect that men who for months had been systematically discouraged from shewing any hostility even under extreme provocation should suddenly recover their martial ardour : yet invasion did compel France really to come into the war ; and the heroism of many French units during the terrible six weeks has still to be disentangled from the chaotic history of those incompetently commanded, ill-equipped<sup>2</sup> and largely broken retreating armies. Civilian morale had not been helped by the gag of the censorship, which by stifling all open criticism left imagination a prey to every possible doubt. Official optimism lived largely on untruth : at the height of disaster M. Reynaud was still assuring the people that all was well. The crowds of panicky refugees, pouring through every village, strained confidence, organization, charity to breaking-point ; the conduct of their own soldiers, at a time when every sort of sentiment was at a key-pitch of nervous tension, precipitated the reaction. After the occupation, peasant after peasant from the Somme to the Loire had the same tale to tell : " The Germans are *très corrects, les cochons* ! The refugees looted and stole a good deal. But the worst of all were our own soldiers."

What was worse than this disorder and indiscipline of the French troops under the demoralization of continued retreat, was their lack of stomach for fighting, as a general body, from the very start. The greater part were unconvinced, indifferent and irresolute, resigned to defeat even before they had given battle, and uncommonly relieved when it was all over. The battle of France was decided for myself when, about May 20th, I saw and spoke with small groups of French *fuyards* near Vimy Ridge. It does not seem to be true that the officers were worse than the men, or vice versa ; sometimes a regiment would find itself abandoned by its officers, sometimes in spite of all their

<sup>1</sup> One incident recounted by a young French officer is typical of many. He was twice severely reprimanded for allowing his soldiers to shoot at German troops on the Rhine, once when the Germans were actually parading before the French lines.

<sup>2</sup> In June some soldiers were without rifles, and others were issued rifles dating from the Franco-Prussian War.

officers' efforts, the men would practically refuse to fight and be glad to surrender. Yet the Armistice stunned France into a moment of incredulous silence, as though men had really believed victory possible without fighting for it.

The revulsion of feeling when it came was bitter, violent and curiously univocal. It was in various parts of occupied France that I lived through the earlier phases of it, from May to August, 1940. How could this disaster have come upon them? Their answer was that only a general rottenness, combined with treason and false leadership, could possibly have brought France so low. One tired of hearing the same phrases repeated: "La France était pourrie", "Il y avait des choses pourries chez nous", "On a été vendu". It will be noticed that corruption was already thought of as belonging to the past. The unrealism of the French works rapidly. But in the present there was a strong sense of instability and deception: what they had been taught to believe adamant had given way like rotten palings, and there seemed no certainty anywhere. "On nous a bourré le crâne". Perfectly true: and watching the unexpected politeness, orderliness and lack of brutality of the occupying forces, a surprising number of Frenchmen came to be convinced that most of what they had heard about such things as Nazi terrorism in Poland was lying propaganda like all the rest. That some were unshakable in this persuasion is a nice index of how completely former beliefs were being torn up and replaced. What surprised me more than anything was the degree of fairmindedness towards the Germans. The order given them, and sternly enforced,<sup>1</sup> to behave well in France, was a true stroke of genius. French peasants were further impressed by the organization and energy of the German troops, and their relative simplicity of diet; by the iron discipline, yet the general spirit of comradeship between junior officers and men when off duty; by their good pay. Many remarked to me: "Hitler can't be such a bad man after all: some of these young fellows are so devoted to him, and would let themselves be cut to pieces for him". Then most farmers' wives had soldiers billeted on them, and found them for the most part well-behaved. Above all, the apparent infallibility of the German plans was enormously impressive. "The Stuttgart traitor was right after all": as though *we* might be brought to admit the accuracy of Lord Haw-Haw. This better dis-

<sup>1</sup> There were several cases of German soldiers being shot for assaults on French girls.

position towards the Germans as a nation was little seen, of course, in the extreme north, and in most of what became the forbidden zone : Frenchmen north of the Somme have too fresh memories of the Great War to be weaned from the integrity of their hate. It is still strong, however, at least in the "unoccupied" zone ; and everywhere in France, I think, except violated Alsace-Lorraine, there was for long more bitterness against the Italians than against the Germans : the very fact of France's defeat compels a Frenchman unwillingly to acknowledge at least the might of Germany.

There was much perplexity about the British. Why had they given France so little support ? So few Frenchmen had seen our troops at all : and we seemed to them to have used our Air Force chiefly to safeguard our final withdrawal. The Dunkirk evacuation was exploited to the full by the Germans, immediately in control of press and radio. Was it not now obvious that we had simply been willing to fight "to the last drop of French blood" ? There is still no appreciation anywhere in France that General Sir John Dill's decision was finally taken on the grounds that by the end of May the Battle of France was already lost, or at least could not be helped by the useless sacrifice of what we had. Our last-minute offer of an Anglo-French Union was plausibly represented as a bribe—of "Dominion status" ! The Oran incident had been taken well everywhere I went north of the Seine, especially wherever people were able to listen in to London ; but south of Paris "Mers-el-Kebir" tended to be a rallying cry against Great Britain, and in the "unoccupied" zone the recollection was for months an intolerable one. Many of our best friends there still regard it as a bad mistake on our part : not all have interpreted the Syrian affair as our final justification.

In those early days a good deal of anti-British as of anti-Belgian feeling, supported by various accusations of treachery, was understandable as an attempt to shift some of the load of guilt on to other shoulders. The sense of the nation's shame was inescapable, however : at Cauchy-la-Tour, half-an-hour's walk from the village where I was then staying, Antoine Pétain, the Marshal's half-brother, kept to his house for some time after the armistice, out of grief and disgust. One heard quite often, from the women especially, such remarks as "On a honte d'être française". Bordeaux therefore or Vichy won little credit at the outset. There was much exasperated comment to the effect that *they* are not occupied : they have sacrificed us to save their

own position—with many a sneer at “les gens du Midi”. The honesty of Pétain himself was not questioned, but they would generally say: “*Que voulez-vous?* he’s eighty-four, he’s doddering.”

But no one readily goes on hugging a state of acute mental and moral discomfort. The transition to a condition of self-justification was facilitated by the feebleness of their previous attitude to the war. There had never been a strong *national* conviction of the evil of the enemy: a large part of the working population and soldiery had from early on conceived the war in cynical terms, as a battle for the arms-merchants, the French and English plutocrats; and Communist and German propaganda industriously fed this frame of mind. Remember that they never had a fraction of such confidence in their government as the British people in Chamberlain’s, and still more in Churchill’s government (and they had good reason for not having it). Now they wanted only peace and quiet, and the restoration of order; they were happy to be out of it with whole skins, and so few killed. The war was as good as over, anyhow: and God help the unmilitary English if France could fall so easily! The peasants got good money from the Germans for what was requisitioned; the women only wanted their prisoners back. It is significant that in Brittany the Germans were at first received none too badly.<sup>1</sup> The Bretons were not traditionally among our best friends in France, as they are to-day. But if for a moment even this Catholic and independent race hesitated as to its attitude, it will be realized how acute was Mr. Belloc’s judgment, made I am told early this year (about the time when Darlan was steadily winning a serious following in *Pétainie*): “The chances are almost even as to whether the support of the French will fall to the one camp or the other.” If, at the right moment, the Germans had had sufficient imagination to conceive the gesture of a general release of French prisoners, they could for a time have carried all before them.

It was some while before the French recovered from the shock and confusion of German “correctness”, though the Germans themselves soon found this polite pose a considerable strain. In any case, men were not slow to realize that it is no better to be plundered politely than impolitely. England was holding her own, and hope dawned that the German victory

<sup>1</sup> In one small town the girls took to going regularly with German soldiers, till one evening the outraged young men of the place administered such sound chastisement to them as to cure them permanently of their Germanophilandering.

would not be final after all. Gallic sarcasm revived, and found a large scope for laughter in Teutonic ridiculousness. One among many stories which went all round France—and this one also happens to be true—concerns the Jesuit college at Vannes. A small boy from the college wrote an insulting letter to a German officer. Instead of ignoring it, the German military authorities descended in force upon the college, instituted an inquisition, discovered the culprit, demanded his expulsion, and in addition, to warn and *punish* the boys, ordered the college to be closed for five weeks !

People were becoming less critical of Pétain's Government, especially after learning that the economic situation in the "unoccupied" zone was as harsh as their own, if not worse. Following on the arrest and dismissal of Laval (the best-hated man in France after Hitler and Mussolini), appreciation of Pétain rose to positive enthusiasm, as this seemed proof of his energy, his actual power and his determination to resist all Quisling activity. About Christmas, 1940, three and a half million portraits of the Marshal were sold in one day's drive in Paris. This considerable support for Pétain was natural : men must have some focus for loyalty and some incarnation of their hopes ; and the old soldier who was given chief credit for nursing his country through the black months of 1917 might prove—who knew ?—more than a French Hindenburg in France's defeat. Confidence in the Marshal—often with explicit distrust of Vichy—remained widespread in the occupied zone at least till the French resisted in Syria and failed to in Indo-China.

In the "unoccupied" zone the development of opinion was slower : there was less stimulus. By the armistice the country had been saved, i.e., from total occupation and from civil war, regarded by Weygand as inevitable had a French government not remained on French soil. The task before France now was to live. The purely physical difficulties of government at Vichy at the start are unexampled in modern history : unworkable living conditions—one Ministry on each floor of the same hotel, with everyone falling over everyone else, absence of privacy or even immunity from importunate visitors, intense cold and frequent failure of the water supply in buildings contrived for the summer season ; lack of documents, dossiers, office equipment ; poor communications with the rest of the country ; isolation, in a purely bourgeois milieu, and with no sure means of ascertaining the state of public opinion through-

out France. When this state of affairs became publicly known,<sup>1</sup> there was rather more tolerance for any administrative hesitancy or slowness. But these were small problems compared with the economic question. It was realized with dismay that many industries on opposite sides of the line of demarcation could not exist, the one without the other: tanning and cattle-raising for example; or the coal-mines in the "unoccupied" zone, and the tools and tackle to work them from the north. The armistice had not in fact established, in the minds of the French signatories, a watertight partition between the two zones, and theoretically Vichy should have retained full control of internal administration in the northern two-thirds of France. But in practice, when, to take only one example, metal was needed in the "unoccupied" zone to provide cans for the meat-canning industry, the Germans only allowed Vichy to have the metal on condition that 60 per cent. of the canned meat be despatched for sale to the occupied zone. And it was impossible for Vichy to make public this or any other example of German blackmail. The food situation in unoccupied France is extremely grave, and it is no exaggeration to say that the French, men, women and children, have already suffered a full year of undernourishment. Lack of nutritious food is particularly painful in winter—when many parts of the "unoccupied" zone are considerably colder than England—as fuel is also scarce. In any estimate of the background of contemporary French opinion, the factor of mass-hunger can scarcely be over-emphasized. What then is the attitude of the French towards the British blockade? With time it has become well-known to most that the Germans take up to 40 per cent. of imperial products arriving in the port of Marseilles, and the Italians up to a further 30 per cent. Wheat is scarce: but it is also known that at the time of the German invasion France possessed stocks of wheat sufficient for nearly three years. A jest current this summer in France, whenever yet another wine-shop was entirely without wine, was to remark: "Oh yes, the British blockade, I suppose?" Therefore some went so far as to say: "We cannot understand why you British let the ships through from Africa. War is not a matter of sentiment, and nearly everything that arrives goes to feed the enemy."

<sup>1</sup> In an early number of *La Cité Nouvelle*, Victor Dillard had an excellent article on the material and moral background of Government life at Vichy. A principal effect was that Ministers lived from day to day, and found little time to think out a coherent policy.

There seems to have been as much misconception on this side of the Channel as, at first, in France itself, about the truth of the term "unoccupied". Actually the press, the wireless, the very text of laws and decrees, are all subject to German censorship, directly or indirectly. In practice the whole economic life of France, including her finance, is also at the Nazis' mercy. Completely open control by officials in German uniform is exercised only at seaports and airports and in general for the execution of the strict armistice terms.<sup>1</sup> But "unoccupied" France swarms with German agents. A year ago a competent authority estimated that there were two thousand women agents and one thousand men working in Lyons alone.

The Germans have gained much by not allowing the degree of their control to appear, and by cowing the French Government into complete official silence on the matter. After five months of armistice Pétain was still saying to visitors from the provinces: "Tell your friends that I am not free. The Germans do not ask: they command." It came as a shock to many Frenchmen in Lyons to learn that when *Figaro* was suppressed for a few days, it was by direct order from the German authorities. Not that they were under any illusion as to the completeness of indirect control: the tone of almost every newspaper, though written by Frenchmen, was clear enough proof of that. Some Englishmen seem to have accepted the reason broadcast by the Germans, to explain the temporary suppression of *Temps Nouveau* last spring, viz., that it had "opposed the policy of the Vichy Government". Actually such rank non-conformity on the part of a lawful newspaper would be only less unthinkable in Pétainie than open opposition to the Third Reich. M. Fumet's offences were in fact certain modest quips and pranks at the expense of the Germans.<sup>2</sup> There was possibly irony in the fresh title he chose, *Temps Nouveau* instead of *Temps Présent*: but assuredly all his public "opposition", whether to the Vichy regime or to the Nazis, had to be of that level of discretion. Censorship works by instruction on the general lines to be followed, and by the constant threat of

<sup>1</sup> At first German officers and men from the nearby airport could often be seen in uniform in the streets of Lyons: but latterly they always change into civilian dress immediately on returning to their hotels.

<sup>2</sup> Such as his photo, during the Cyrenaica campaign, of a magnificent piece of machinery, in which a large wheel and a small wheel turn on the same bearing, with a caption pointing out that a few grains of sand would suffice to throw the whole affair out of gear. Or his paragraph of praise and thanks to the Germans for their unparalleled generosity in permitting postcards to pass between the two zones with seven lines of writing instead of four.

suppression for any imprudence. But semi-official commentaries are frequently imposed, and are then printed in every paper. For example, a shameful declaration, faithfully reproducing the cynical German version of Serbian breach of faith and deliberate provocation, was issued in this way from Vichy, following the German invasion of Yugoslavia. It goes without saying that in no newspaper is there much news of Britain, at least in the worse periods (for there are cycles of less and greater control), except what can be twisted to her discredit.<sup>1</sup> It is not true that Swiss papers have been forbidden entry into France: they were to have been, but an agreement was reached by which certain Swiss papers printed a special French edition, which might then be sold in France! Obviously there always was a group of anti-British Frenchmen, and these now can say what they like, while our friends are silenced. The average Frenchman is at least as ignorant of Britain and her institutions as the average Englishman is of France and hers; it can then be imagined what sort of picture Frenchmen are now forming of us, under German-inspired guidance. Democracy, for them, means only the "democracy" of the Third Republic; and so of all else. To assert that Wladimir d'Ormesson was writing pro-British articles in *Figaro* betrays gross ignorance of the present condition of journalism in France: actually, his very fair-minded articles were almost completely silent about foreign policy. All that French Catholics knew of the Sword of the Spirit, to give only one example of their ignorance of the contemporary English scene, was contained, for those who noticed it, in one brief paragraph in small print, without a heading, in *La Croix*: this referred to the Kingsway meetings. Incidentally, the America of French news, especially as regards the war, seems hardly the same country as the America of English news. And what about our B.B.C. bulletins? South of Paris it is not possible to listen in to London on medium waves, owing to deliberate and indeliberate interference; and, just as in England, relatively few people have short-wave sets. Then our short-wave emissions are savagely jammed: so that at Lyons, for example, it was sometimes easier on a powerful

<sup>1</sup> Two examples of distortion of fact over Syria: the first, Vichy's use of the hoary Nazi trick of denying what had never been officially asserted by Britain, viz., the presence of German troops in Syria, while conveniently ignoring the actual assertion regarding "tourists". The other occurred in a privately printed news-sheet, where a French priest's uncensored letter from Syria of June 15th (I had read it on its arrival), in which he gave evidence for the truth of every British official assertion, was summarized in such a way as to imply that he did just the opposite.

set to get the early morning bulletin from Brazzaville than the news in French from London. Even those fortunate enough to be able to hear Allied broadcasts could not get much news about what was going on in their own midst : the generality of Frenchmen still know practically nothing about the concentration camps in the "unoccupied" zone, nor are they aware that one in eight of their letters is read by the secret censorship ; and relatively few have seen the private reports that circulate on the brutal Nazification—in cynical defiance of the armistice terms—of Alsace-Lorraine. But what more directly concerns us is the daily flood of unfair representation, often reaching the point of vicious hate, of Britain and the British cause. At the end of the last article by Maurras that I read—it was in the relatively balanced *Candide*—he dragged in an assertion, largely irrelevant to his subject, that Mr. Churchill "formerly belonged to that little Anglo-French clique which lamented Joan of Arc's mission and Charles VII's victories. What a pity, they used to say, that these frustrators of all-round union and federation were ever born !" Sane readers discount a certain amount of this sort of propaganda, but as they get little or nothing in a contrary sense, you may be sure that some dirt sticks. Whether we like it or not, it is a fact that France's view of ourselves is being systematically deformed.

It is true that there are at the moment many Frances, some of them not subject to German pressure, or spiritually unassailable by it. In any total estimate of French opinion and the possibilities of the future, one would have to consider the France of the prison-camps<sup>1</sup> ; Free France ; the French colonies supporting the Free French, and those adhering to Vichy ; Alsace-Lorraine ; Japanese-occupied Indo-China. But, as Maritain has pointed out, the decisive moral struggle, as regards the future, lies in metropolitan France.

Even the very schematic summary so far given will suffice to suggest how complicated is the situation in both occupied and "unoccupied" France, and how various are the opinions issuing from it. To underline how different both zones are from any other occupied country, one must briefly consider the position of the Vichy Government and its two present leaders.

<sup>1</sup> A whole article might be written on the extraordinary spiritual revival in certain large camps in France (e.g., those at Rheims), during the first few months—officers and men crowding to retreats and the Sacraments, intensive study of social and moral problems. One chaplain attributed much of this to the fact that they were all in a permanent state of fasting, saying he had understood the real value of Lent for the first time in his life.

Some of the most pro-British Frenchmen I know continue to protest, even in letters dating from the end of last September, that the Vichy Government is a legitimate and not a "Quisling" government. Legally speaking, the change of governmental structure was constitutional. It is important to remember that, even if it had not been so, throughout all the alterations in the French constitution during the century and a half since the Revolution, the tradition of the French Army has always been to support the *de facto* government. This explains why after the armistice so many excellent Army officers did not conceive it their duty to join General de Gaulle. Weygand is intensely traditional in this respect : a number of Generals who know him well gave it as their conviction that no amount of provocation would ever have brought him into open opposition to Germany in North Africa, without an express order from Marshal Pétain.<sup>1</sup> Many a Frenchman to-day, of those who are in no sense collaborationist, will say in effect : "We have a Government which on the whole is a good deal more honest than most of the recent Republican governments, which is genuinely out to save France, and has already done much good. In the sense that it is subject to continual German pressure, and economically at the mercy of the Nazis, it is not free. But it is doing its best to enable France to live." Your Frenchman of this type will be uncomfortable if reminded of the concessions and abasements which, if not treachery to France, look very like treachery to the Allies ; he will defend such actions as the stubborn resistance in Syria on the plea that they had to resist us there so as to be able to threaten resistance to the Axis in Africa : if you demolish this argument, he will probably fall back on the common distinction between Vichy and Pétain.

Philippe Pétain certainly does not give the impression of a man of eighty-five. He is almost sprightly in gait, frank and kindly in manner, he likes to meet men of all classes wherever he goes. He is not a bookish person, and has a considerable genius for words that go to the heart of the people, words that are stamped with the common sense and forthrightness of the soldier or the peasant. This is the sort of thing that has won him much popularity :—It was mentioned to him, during

<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, it is known that Weygand refused to take any action against the Free French colonies, though Darlan had publicly asserted that such action would be taken. It is also said that he was asked to go to Syria, to stiffen resistance there against us, and again refused. We can see why the Germans have worked for his dismissal.

the course of Wavell's advance in Cyrenaica, that Free French troops had played a prominent part in the capture of one of the Italian strongholds: "Ah, les braves garçons!" was his spontaneous comment. He has a simple, not a subtle mind (his handwriting would give no great difficulty to a graphologist); and the stubbornness of a cautious man rather than the courage of a lionheart. His greatest defect is undoubtedly that he is pre-1914 in his conceptions of Europe. His greatest tactical weakness in face of men like Laval and Darlan is that he is capable of only four or five hours' work a day against their twelve or fifteen: they have therefore considerable scope for outmanœuvring him.<sup>1</sup> It is more than probable that he was misinformed on the true situation in Syria (the first occasion on which he spoke directly against Britain). There is no doubt as to his honesty: it is noteworthy that neither Mr. Churchill nor any other member of the Government has ever made any sort of attack on his personal position. It was remarked in France how absent *Gaullistes* were frequently condemned to death with confiscation of all their property, while *Gaullistes* in France and under arrest always received a much lighter sentence. No one will have been surprised at Pétain's commutation of Colette's death-sentence. Last May there was organized a week of intensive propaganda, in the press and by radio, against the Free French movement, with much abuse of Britain: the climax of the effort was to have been a broadcast speech by Pétain. This was twice postponed, and when the Marshal did speak he made no reference to Britain at all, contenting himself with an appeal for internal unity. It is not true that he is anxious to conclude a peace with the Nazis: for one thing, even before a prolonged Russian resistance was certain, the leaders of the French Army had no doubt that the Germans could no longer win the war. Actually, shortly before his attack on Russia, Hitler proposed to Pétain, as a step towards final settlement, the withdrawal of the demarcation line to the north of Paris—a change that would have brought great economic and administrative advantages to Vichy—on condition that the French should collaborate in the defence of their coasts against any attempt at debarkation. Pétain refused.

In simplest terms, the course of Pétain's policy has been this:

<sup>1</sup> The nearest Darlan ever came to dismissal was when, at the Conseil d'Empire summoned at the opening of the Syrian campaign, certain questions of Weygand revealed to Pétain that Darlan had been intercepting and suppressing Weygand's reports to him from Africa.

he signed the armistice because Weygand and himself were convinced that the war was as good as ended, and therefore considered it futile needlessly to prolong the struggle, or to expose France to the dangers of internal chaos. Those confident enough in the temper of Britain to think otherwise, and aware, as the Marshal was not, of the character of the gangster government in Germany, immediately foresaw the chain of humiliations that would follow: "Nous allons boire toutes les hontes!" Later, when the war did not end, and the full implications of the armistice became more apparent, it would still have been possible, absolutely speaking, to defy the infamous German pressure at any one of half a dozen crises, give orders to the remainder of the Fleet and all the Colonies overseas to join forces again with the Allies, and resign. Psychologically and practically speaking, it was not. Apart from such facts as the two million hostages in the clutch of the Nazis, or the determination of backers like the *Comité des Forges* to keep their industries producing at any price, such a step would have meant that the shameful armistice had after all been useless. And Pétain is stubbornly determined to justify the armistice, for which, as he has said, he takes full responsibility. Once the Nazis realized that he would never go back on what he had signed, the blackmailing value to the French of their ships and colonies was practically nil, and they were completely in German hands.

Some chief points about Darlan are these. He has a backing—chiefly "bourgeois"—in "unoccupied" France, such as Laval never had. This is partly because Darlan is not merely out for himself, but is also a patriot. From February till last summer, during which time he was Dauphin, Vice-President, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Minister of the Navy, Minister of the Interior, in control of the police, the press, the radio, there was a sustained attempt to invest Darlan with some share in the Marshal's popularity. They were often together in public, their photos were often reproduced together in the press, one on each side of some new declaration of policy (Darlan's sometimes in the fifth column). This bid for popularity seemed to be a failure, till Darlan began to give broadcast talks. To me it seemed poor ranting stuff: Frenchmen of all shades of opinion assured me that it was getting a real hold on the public mind, and indeed this became apparent after a short time. He is then an able propagandist, all the more dangerous because men are less alert to political ruses in a sailor, though actually for

the past fifteen years Darlan has served more in the *couloirs* than at sea. He is devoid of religion—possibly not even baptized—and has shewn signs of crude anti-clericalism. It seems true to say that he is sincerely anxious to save France ; he thinks he can do this by outwitting Germany in diplomacy ; he hates the British. But he is also consumed by personal ambition. His immediate goal is to be created "Admiral of France", on a parity of honour with Marshal Pétain : and, according to General Huntzinger, he has already been promised the title of "Admiral of Europe" in Hitler's New World ! He has had a powerful influence on the development of the *Légion des Combattants*, the *Compagnons de France* and the *Chantiers de Jeunesse*—always in the direction of : "You cannot serve France and Britain : there is only one leader of France, and to support de Gaulle is to be a traitor."

For numbers of Frenchmen, especially young Frenchmen, long held a position of balanced loyalty : they were both for Pétain and for de Gaulle. The vast majority of Frenchmen regard their countrymen fighting with us—whom they prefer to call Free French rather than Gaullistes—as the saviours of French honour. The split over de Gaulle has resulted chiefly from Gaullist movements *inside* France. There have been considerable fluctuations all along in the support given to Pétain, to Vichy in general, and to the Allied cause. The correlation between the developments of the war and the change of attitudes has been specially interesting, but it is too complicated to be gone into here. The Syrian business won many to our side, and also lost us many. Up till then, the romantic belief in a secret understanding between Pétain and London was still widespread, against all evidence or persuasion. It should be noted that we tend, increasingly since June, *not* to have the youth of "unoccupied" France with us. They are receiving a strong ideological formation, largely along *Action Française* lines, in the *Compagnons* and *Chantiers*, the two Government youth organizations which, after several periods of crisis, notably last winter, are now succeeding remarkably well. These boys and young men are being taught that they have one duty : to forward the interests of France. Many, not all, will admit that a British victory is essential for France's resurrection : but, once risen again, "we shall no longer be the dupes of England." Some of Britain's strongest supporters, are to be found among those who fought with us in the Great War. Among the clergy, the secular priests in certain parts—

e.g., Haute-Savoie—tended to be strongly collaborationist : in the occupied zone on the other hand, many parish priests seem to be in the forefront of the resistance. Throughout France the regular clergy, on the whole, feel strong sympathy for Britain, while at the same time maintaining a reserved loyalty towards the *de facto* Government. The better among all Catholics, clerics and laymen, have suffered bitterly from the fact that none of their bishops has given a strong lead to the faithful. There was however a general lack of a Catholic spirit of uncompromise with evil : silence concerning Alsace-Lorraine, silence concerning the anti-Jewish laws, almost complete silence concerning Nazi-ism.

One is often asked how many Frenchmen are pro-British, how many pro-German, etc. It is difficult to give proportions, but one may say this : Everyone desires a British victory—it is to their own interests (but while in the occupied zone there is a real assent to the necessity of our victory for France, in the “unoccupied” there is often only a notional one). In the occupied zone a large majority are warmly pro-British : in the “unoccupied” zone a considerable minority are not pro-British. But it should be remembered that in general the hearts of the French are sounder than their heads. There is scarcely a decent Frenchman who, for all his anti-British talk, would not imperil his own safety to assist, for example, a stray British pilot. Scarcely any one is pro-German. Even Laval is in no sense pro-German : he is purely pro-Laval.

Before August 1941, it was still true to say that a possible majority in occupied France, a sure majority in “unoccupied” France, gave some sort of support to Pétain, even though at the time of the Syrian resistance it seemed to many that Darlan had more or less replaced the Marshal in effective power, and that Laval’s dismissal had been a display of energy which could never be repeated. Ultimate developments, and a fuller knowledge of the history of Hitler’s threats and Pétain’s resistance, will be the only adequate criteria for a final judgement on the old man’s policy. In what way developments at Vichy from August to November have affected public opinion, it is still too soon to estimate from outside France.

A very common attitude in France, though less obtrusive than the tumult of the partisans, is one of reserve and common-sense : quietly alive to the great facts of the situation—the temporary German domination within, the continued resistance abroad under Britain’s lead ; quietly sure of the need to

pray, wait, suffer, hold one's tongue and keep one's temper. Thinkers, priests, mothers tend to follow this line of sanity : they do not convert their feelings into battle-cries, but their feelings about Albion and Vichy are plain enough. " France now is not France, as you know", one such Frenchman wrote to me recently ; " your letters will be for us like *litterae a patria*."

Now the sort of lowest common denominator in this confusion of tendencies and opinions—a confusion much greater than I have been able to suggest : in fact I scarcely met any three Frenchmen with the same point of view—is that revulsion of feeling against the past and turning of men's minds to some sort of new future which I stressed at the beginning of this article. Few know yet just what they want in the political sphere, to modify or replace the constitution of the Third Republic ; many are very certain that they do not want the sort of constitution at present being sketched out at Vichy : they do know all of them that they want to break with the system, expel the poisons, cure the weaknesses that made inevitable their present spiritual and material distress. That is all. Everywhere in France to-day it is as evident as daylight—and as tremendous a reality. An article in *Le Glaive de l'Esprit* from a recent recruit to the Free French Forces, bitterly attacking all the works and pomps of Vichy, inevitably bears this mark of the Frenchman who has left France, not in June, 1940, but in 1941. Speaking of the remodelling that will be necessary in France after the war, he says that it must be "*equally far removed from the hateful institutions of the enemy, and from return to a past which is dead*" (italics his). In France itself this spirit is reflected everywhere, even to the titles of the two reviews which have replaced *Études*, *Construire* in the occupied zone, *La Cité Nouvelle* in the "unoccupied." The strong rhythms and sentiments of Péguy, prophet of the New France which is still the Old France, are read and quoted as never perhaps before. Péguy himself might have been moved, to witness now, in the singing and the marching, the defiant optimism of hungry adolescence (so strangely reminiscent of Germany in the 'twenties), how the conviction of the possibility of France's spiritual and material re-birth has begun to inspire those who will be called upon to expiate their country's present shame in the post-war reconstruction. But he might have reminded them :

Ce ne sont pas les Ecossais qui sauveront la France.  
Ce sont les Français qui sauveront la France.

By the side of this interior revolution, the Vichy Government's efforts are chiefly of value in so far as they have helped men to better awareness and crisper formulation of what was stirring within them. The Vichy Government has indeed achieved some useful reforms, such as the strong step towards the suppression of alcoholism, the tightening-up of divorce, the granting of family-allowances, the re-introduction of a religious element into education. But it has also been clumsy enough to lay the probable foundations of a good deal of anti-clericalism, by such ill-advised steps as the repeal of the law forbidding religious to teach, which had been a dead letter for twenty years, the restoration to the Church of the property-rights in the Lourdes grotto, the reinstatement of the Carthusians. These unnecessary moves serve only to identify in the popular mind a widely disliked government and the cause of the Church. Cardinal Gerlier's embassy to Spain, and what he said there, and in France on his return, created an equally unfortunate impression in the minds of the working-classes.

The ludicrous aspect of Vichy is seen only by the better informed. Pétain's exaggerated parappings of his fidelity to the Catholic Church and his attempts to revive the Christian family, are quaintly offset by the fact that he is himself living with a divorcée. Or again, though ministerial corruption is always spoken of as a thing of the past, when Achard was suddenly replaced at the Ministry of Food, it is said to have been for embezzlement: the only difference from the days of the Third Republic, as one French friend remarked, seemed to be that then the Chamber and the country would have heard all about it, while now all was hushed up.

The more grievous side of Vichy is something which, no matter how terrible are France's difficulties, we may not, in fairness to our own cause, condone: nor should our propaganda allow Frenchmen to forget it. But we must try to see what were and are the roots of it. The men in France responsible for the armistice and, still more, for the policy of collaboration, are betraying not only their own country but Europe and the world in so far as they are making a moral surrender. More than one French friend was of the opinion that they all are: a number would argue that for several among them it is a feint, justifiable by the extreme necessities of the moment, even though such tactics may not only expose France to the danger of a coup d'état by some sincere collaborator such as Laval, but may also harm the spiritual integrity of a section

of the people. Possibly it is too easily forgotten in England that collaboration, in the sense of the harnessing of French factories to the German war-machine, would have taken place in any case, as it has done in Belgium, Holland and other occupied countries : and that those who gain most by the maintenance of industry in action are not the employers, who only add to their wealth, but the workers, who must have work to eat and to live.<sup>1</sup> But for a Government calling itself French to lend its countenance to such collaboration seems to be letting necessity too easily trespass on the preserves of honour. But the word "honour", as one Frenchman said to me, falls from the lips of Vichy spokesmen as easily and as vainly as the word "peace" from the lips of Hitler. The unreality of French "idealism" often recalled to me the similar unreality of Eire's sublime detachment from the wickedness of Europe. Frenchmen often seemed to be trying to act and to think as though the armistice and the occupation had never occurred. The rebuke of Henri Massis is spoken to the very soul of Pétainie ; "There do not exist two loyalties, a loyalty of action and one of knowledge." But a nation exasperated beyond endurance is not likely to be logical. France at the moment is a nervous patient that needs careful handling.

Shame and depression make a good forcing-ground for grievances ; and laying the blame on Britain, in the fashion already mentioned, was one way of blinding themselves to Britain's present grounds of complaint against France. But two grievances seem to have some foundation in fact, and are important. One is that Britain betrayed the victory of 1918. A recent comment in *The Tablet* succinctly formulates and admits the exact accusation of the French : d'Abernon's diaries, the writer reminds us, "tell most clearly how Germany had no sooner been defeated than all our efforts were directed to restoring her broken power, in order to preserve the European balance against France." Frenchmen are not convinced that we have yet fully repented of this form of criminal lunacy. The other grievance is that we should have brought it about, in Syria, that Frenchmen should shed the blood of Frenchmen. Most were glad that we had taken Syria, realizing that we had saved it from the Germans : but, they asked, if you had to take it, why could you not do it yourselves ? It was maintained in the French press that Mr.

<sup>1</sup> Even Switzerland, whom no one will accuse of dishonour or lack of sympathy for the Allied cause, is manufacturing almost exclusively for the Axis.

Churchill had formally promised General de Gaulle that his troops would never be required to fight against their fellow-countrymen, and that the form of enlistment in the Free French Forces also contains a clause providing against this possibility. For other non-French observers in France besides myself, the fighting in Syria is one of Hitler's greatest victories.

Hysterical bad temper has also resulted in a very unjust attitude not only towards the work, by no means all of it evil, of the Popular Front, but also towards the whole structure of the Third Republic.<sup>1</sup> Now however imperfect, the Third Republic was France; and a first attempt at the friendly shaking which this overwrought patient, Pétain's France, requires, might be to steal their own powder and blast them with the wisdom of Péguy. One might further point out that Republican France at least never imagined she could achieve her mission in this world by "sacred egoism", or by cloaking her desertion in a false assumption of indifference, or by shirking the blood and sweat and tears. Nor has anyone ever civilized his barbarian enemies by slavish imitation of them. It is indeed necessary to shatter the idealistic cloud-castles of the French, to establish in their minds the profound conviction that their salvation depends not only on a British victory—won partly by their co-operation—but also on their own spiritual victory over the temptation of Pilate offered to a whole nation.

But it is also necessary to *reassure* men who have learned to be intensely suspicious of ultimate British intentions and plans. One idea they cannot get out of their heads is that we are ever trying to divide and weaken France.<sup>2</sup> De Gaulle's recent appeal to Frenchmen to refrain from premature revolt, which they imagine we are fomenting, will have done great good. On another cardinal question we shall win their confidence by trying to demonstrate by every possible means and on every possible occasion that we have given full adhesion of mind and will to Point 3 of the Atlantic Charter: "They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live". It is to be hoped that we shall be able to distribute in "unoccupied" France, in leaflet form, copies of General de Gaulle's Albert Hall speech of November 15th.

<sup>1</sup> Of course many Frenchmen, even in the "unoccupied" zone, are the first to protest against this ingratitude to their grandparents.

<sup>2</sup> There were in fact, long before Germany's attack on Russia, unfortunate coincidences between certain points of British propaganda and points made in *L'Humanité*.

His definite assurance that the Free French are at one with their countrymen in not wishing to restore the evils of the old régime, and in desiring a true national revolution, will gain him greatly increased sympathy from every man in France.

France's greatest difficulty about Britain is perhaps to believe in the possibility of our securing a final military decision. In France, as elsewhere, successful action in the field remains our best propaganda. The triumph of the spirit in Europe has as its first condition the success of the sword.

PETER KLINE.

---

---

## *The Ploughshare*

I who was steel—  
 A sword-blade tempered for a proven knight—  
 To grace the tourney, or for woe or weal,  
 To serve his prowess in all deadly fight—  
 Battered and bent and rusted creak I now  
 Across a foeman's field, its waste to plough.

The grey gulls call  
 Above the horses' heads, and follow me ;  
 Insistent o'er the thrushes' madrigals,  
 They haunt the spring with cry from that far sea  
 Over whose tides men bore me—victor's spoil—  
 To beat my soul to iron, my strength to toil.

Yet this doth last,  
 Sinew and heart of me—the memory  
 Of my lost King : as the proud legions passed,  
 My sunlit steel in accolade flashed high,  
 While a Crusader's head was bent to kiss  
 The Cross my hilt once bore—so know I this—

That still to-day  
 That Cross is part with me, and yet doth yield  
 The power whereby I cleave my onward way,  
 And signs its blessing on the fruitful field—  
 So shall the upland furrow hold for me  
 The triumph and the love of Calvary.

C. M. F. G. ANDERSON.

## THE PEOPLE'S COUNTRY BACKGROUND

**P**ERHAPS not for a hundred years, in our industrialized history, have such a large proportion of Britons lived, temporarily at any rate, in the country relatively to the built-up areas. Policy and events have brought this to pass within two years. Prudence may render the change permanent, and if so it will but be the recovery of a tradition which was on the point of being lost.

Yet those of our race who have been in moderately comfortable circumstances have never ceased to use their greater freedom of choice, by living rurally either altogether or part time. Lossiemouth, Criccieth, Chequers—to these, Prime Ministers have turned. The capital has never unhealthily monopolized our leading elements, as some continental capitals have swallowed theirs. May we look forward, in a phase of cautious de-centralization, to a greater comparative cultural importance of other cities and county towns, as in days when Norwich, Bristol, Durham, York, Edinburgh, and Winchester were each a regional metropolis, and when Defoe found Devon the richest, most industrious shire of all?

Evacuation leading to human redistribution, and this to closer touch with the older England and the primaries, may bring the people a new lease of life and social vigour. This is said without derogation from the superb faith and crisis-resistance shown by the nine million people in that province of mingled towns called London; but whether such solid blocks of humanity ought to exist as vulnerable giant units is a question.

The nation's ordeal has not simply put vast numbers of people into less urban surroundings, but has actually made agriculture news, crops a colloquial topic, and country notes a feature of many journals and reviews. Town schools, now rusticated, pore on the activities and tools which were familiar to Virgil, Piers Plowman, and Cobbett. From personal observation, I should say that the young will be made more English—more British—by being thrown, Antaeus-wise, upon their pristine sources; within truant's step of birds-nest, stile, brook, meadow and orchard—the same childhood as was known to Shakespeare, Raleigh, Blake, Nelson, Livingstone, Wesley,

Wordsworth, Tennyson, and indeed nine out of ten of all notable Britons up to the Smoke Era.

Much that is valuable in our race must perish without close touch with earth and its green and growing things, and its plough-horses, dogs, birds and its autumn fires and open horizons. As for our painting and literature, both would dwindle to comparative unimportance without this element. From the first English nature-song "Summer is i-cumen in," and Chaucer's "small foules melodie," to Shakespeare's rich country palette in "The Tempest," "The Winter's Tale," and "A Midsummer Night's Dream," the ineradicable instinct is asserted. The younger Milton carried it on divinely in "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" and "Comus" and "Arcades"; yes, and in certain moving nocturnes in "Paradise Lost." More familiarly Izaak Walton pursued it in his angling dialogues, and Defoe shows a characteristic national sense of "the lie of the land" in his "Journeys," as Aubrey had done before him. Cottage, mansion, little sea-side quay, mule-track, sheep-grazing downs, hunting forests—how those itineraries flourished. Bacon and Evelyn on Gardens were as much in request as Tusser on Husbandrie and, much later, Cobbett's Rural Rides.

It is one of *the* constants in our chequered history—this fondness for talking, knowledgeably, as Shakespeare could, of "red wheat on the headlands" and of flowers that take the winds of March with beauty. It redeemed the prosaic eighteenth century, which saw Thomson's popular "Seasons" in many cottage window-sills, Clare the fine peasant poet, Crabbe ("Nature's sternest painter and the best," as Byron said), Cowper's honest and fresh descriptions, White's delicious Selborne gossip, Collins's magic "Ode to Evening," Gray's noble churchyard "Elegy," the Border singers who were Burns's precursors and contemporaries, Smart's one lyrical outburst, the "Song to David," Dyer's delicious "Grongar Hill" and his "Fleece," and Phillips's celebration of the apple countries in "Cider," even Dodsley's "Agriculture" and Akenside's rhetorical verse. That "dry" but manly age of Goldsmith's "Deserted Village," of Johnson, Burke, Hogarth and Reynolds, Fielding and Smollett, remember, was incubating men of the mould of Wellington, Nelson, Hood, Collingwood, Wesley, Scott, Galt, Burns, and Byron.

The open air never ceased to circulate through towns and townsmen. "Field-smells known in infancy," is Shelley's

phrase. Among these were Wordsworth reared, and Coleridge; and though Keats, Lamb, and Hunt were not, they lost few chances of interviews with nature. As for Hazlitt, his exquisite wild flavours have been too little recognized—"Give me the robin redbreast, pecking the crumbs at the door, or warbling on the leafless spray, the same glancing form that has followed me wherever I have been, and 'done its spiriting gently'; or the rich notes of the thrush that startle the ear of winter, and seem to have drunk up the full draught of joy from the very sense of contrast. To these I adhere, and am faithful, for they are true to me; and, dear in themselves, are dearer for the sake of what is departed, that dreaming world in the innocence of which they sat and made sweet music." From Winterslow Hut on Salisbury Plain he wrote many a lovely page of *weather* and scenery, cloudland and wind-symphony, and when Charles and Mary Lamb visited him they gathered mushrooms to put into the hashed mutton for supper. Hazlitt's foot journeys are among the best in any language, ending often in an inn waiting for his chicken and sausages to cook; at Alton enjoying his dish and reading, "the flavour of Congreve's style prevailing over all"; or at Llangollen, Rousseau's story which summarized his roving enthusiasms; or hearkening to Coleridge's wizard talk on the road to Shrewsbury, and later his and Wordsworth's along the north Somerset coast.

Dickens and Thackeray, and perhaps Trollope, remained town men. But George Eliot and Blackmore, following Scott, knew the perennial appeal of the great green background to our life; whilst Tennyson has forever transferred to poetry the very *attar* of the Lincolnshire wolds and seas, and of the south country, the Weald, and "the quarried downs of Wight." In some ways he is the subtlest and most evocative and exact of them all: with Milton, a master of epithet and landscape. That is a reward of his gipsy-like roamings on fens, wolds, downs, heaths, meres and cliffs, and of his passion for Homer, Virgil, Shakespeare and Scott. It is an error to think of Browning as a Human Comedy man, to the exclusion of nature-magic; though Mediterranean nature figures more in his pages than English, cherry-time in Kent is still there, and bird-notes from the ash-tree yonder. There are wood-notes wild in plenty in Browning, whose music is as real as that of Brahms and Franck, asking only a prepared ear.

In the wild north country I have seen people, without special

gifts of words indeed, but as truly impassioned by the hills and dark sweep of moorland as Wordsworth or the Brontës. There are Britons still—in most counties of England, Scotland, and Wales—who could not be induced to live in places less lonely than their own. Space they must have to develop in, bodily and mentally. This makes for a certain original individuality and self-dependence, when they must, more than their street-born fellows, find their own amusements, fuel, water, and lighting, and grow some of their own food.

In his "Scholar Gipsy," Arnold threw an attractive air of illusion over the "lone ale-house on the Berkshire moors," "Hinksey and its wintry ridge," the quieter reaches of the Thames, and "the lone, sky-pointing tree" on the uplands; and was differently successful with "the cheerful silence of the fells" in the North. Mention of that Thames valley, well inland, reminds one of the exquisite, very English genius of Robert Bridges, whose music is too easily overlooked because it is sparing of brass-notes and drum-beats. His voice, like Cordelia's, is low and sweet—an excellent thing in woman, and in some poets if it do not lead to popular neglect:

Her beauty would surprise  
Gazers on Autumn eves  
Who watch the broad moon rise  
Upon the scattered sheaves.

The nature backgrounds of Swinburne, and even of Morris, are usually too generalized to be English; and therefore, like Turner's paintings, miss the English taste which Constable and Gainsborough and lesser men hit so well. Meredith had a considerable vogue as a rabbi-poet of nature, but his "Melampus" and "Woods of Westermains" are too stylized for our palate now: we feel that the great out-of-doors was to him more of a regimen, a medicine or a mental gymnasium than a sensuous joy or than a transparency to the idea of God. "Love in a Valley" is more poetic, less crossed with theory, and with the sad, self-conscious modern kind of paganism. Metaphysic (and not a true one) intrudes also into Hardy's jagged, interesting verse, though I shall always unashamedly prefer the great Wessex novels, as noble and solid in their way as Scott's gallery, if less sunny. Kipling's subjects in his later days were of the home-country, as in "Poet's Song," or "The Way through the Wood," or "Sussex." Sussex indeed has been inordinately lucky. Its laureate is Belloc, who even appears at times to advance menacingly on his admiring readers with the challenge,

"What have *you* to say against incomparable Sussex—or, for that matter, in favour of any other shire?" But his sympathies, like everything about him, are catholic, and he celebrates many places in England and Europe, and sees all drenched in history, human deeds, and the Faith. His mention of certain old beamed inns which serve honest beer must have "made" them for the modern tourist.

You would suppose, from English literature in peace-time, and from much conversation, that weather, movement and the countryside were our national preoccupations. What naturalists we have had, in Charles Waterton, White, W. H. Hudson, Jefferies, and more recently Massingham, Beach Thomas, Cherry Kearton, merely to begin the list! The truth has, as usual, given rise to a bogus market for "rural charm," and irreclaimable townees have "got away with" books about adventurously going into the lonely wilds to live, and it turns out that these wilds are a villa with kitchen garden at Maidenhead or Walton, near to cinema, shops, electric railway and 'phone. Or publicity men, with white hands and plus fours, broadcast themselves as "the new farmer." Humbug is short-lived, or rather yields place to other forms of it. Hence the utility of knowing the genuine article. The genuine article does not guffaw at the esoteric joke, "fat stock prices"; it does not drawl "Oi du be a-tellin' yeu, zur," nor lean over gates, nor remind you of something in *Punch* or a B.B.C. *Zummerzetz* programme. It is better drawn in Adrian Bell's "Corduroy" and later books, in V. Sackville-West's Kentish farm epic, "The Land," in H. E. Bates's stories, and in Street's first and second, and by Sheila Kaye-Smith.

After the war, if not before, we are going to learn the truth of Chesterton's remark that the family and village are the real basic units of all healthy society—where every occupation and profession visibly relates to the first creative facts, and is organic thereto. The love of these things can be enormously reinforced by our literature—but not, alas, as it is taught in so many schools, where an unhealthy phobia against poetry, word-music and scenery is often set up, and the emerging adult ever after reads nothing but a superficial newspaper, fiction, and an occasional tendentious sixpenny.

W. J. BLYTON.

## POLISH TEACHING ON THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

POLAND is proud to call herself "The Kingdom of Mary." And certainly our history has been associated with the name and love of the Blessed Virgin in a manner scarcely paralleled in that of other countries. According to tradition, the first Church in Poland was established at Gniezno (Gnesen) and dedicated to our Lady's Assumption. Our Polish soldiers still sing the hymn "Bogu Rodzica-Dziewica" (O Mother of God and Virgin). This was chanted on all our battlefields as a hymn for the fight, and it is incidentally the oldest example of the Polish language, thus taking us back through an existence of nearly one thousand years. The Holy See has approved for Polish use an extra invocation in the Litany of Loreto : *Maria, Regina Poloniae*.

Now, what is the position of Polish teaching on the subject of the Immaculate Conception ?

In his series of sermons with the general title of "O Pannie Czystej" (On the Immaculate Virgin) Jan Paterek, from Szamotuly near Posen and a professor at the University of Cracow, declared—about 1500 A.D.—that "our teaching here at Cracow has constantly recognized, and indeed for centuries believed, that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without sin." This university at Cracow, which was first established in 1364 and later reconstructed in 1400, had a far-reaching influence on the intellectual and spiritual life of Poland. Consequently we are unable to accept the suggestion that it was the Franciscans who first brought the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to our country, since they did not reach Poland until the second half of the fifteenth century.

The doctrine had, of course, its adversaries and critics—in Poland, as elsewhere. The Dominicans were especially prominent in this respect for, appealing to the arguments of St. Thomas Aquinas, they taught that the Mother of God was not free from original sin in the first moment of her conception and so was not conceived immaculate. In opposition to this school of thought, Petrus Polonus (Peter of Poland) introduced, in the course of the fourteenth century, the teaching and arguments of Duns Scotus.

Paul of Poland, then known by his Latin equivalent of Paulus Polonus, was a lecturer at Cracow in the fourteenth

century and, though not as famous a teacher as his national namesake, Peter, he created a remarkable sensation by dying suddenly in the pulpit of Cracow cathedral while he was delivering a sermon against the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This startling occurrence was quickly noised abroad throughout Europe. At Paris in particular it was referred to the "finger of God," and it was subsequently brought forward as an argument in favour of the doctrine at the Council of Basle.

From the "*Defensorium Mariae*" we learn that one witness of Paul's sudden death was a certain "*Joannes Polonus, doctor medicinae et baccalaureus theologiae.*" This was none other than the later Bishop of Cracow, Jan Korabita z Radlic, who actually took the news of Paul's death to Paris. When he became bishop, he introduced a feast of the Immaculate Conception into the diocese of Cracow, making it a solemn festival "*chori et fori*" for December 8th and instituting a vigil on the day preceding. This was in 1390.

But even prior to this date, namely in 1351, Bishop Bodzanta had consecrated one of the chapels of Cracow cathedral to the Immaculate Conception. And during this century, altars dedicated to this special aspect or title of our Lady were erected in all the cathedral churches of Poland. Several bishops followed the lead given by Cracow so that, when the Synod of Kalisz met in 1420, all it had to do was to ratify for the whole country a feast and a devotion that were already accepted.

In the "*pia dictamina*" of Wacław Ubogi you can discover the following "pious" threats uttered against the opponents of the doctrine :

Is ergo juxta decretum  
Sacra fide sane fretum  
Firmans ostentaculum

Hereticus est censendus,  
Ab Ecclesia spernendus  
Divino eulogio.

Mediatrice carebit  
Ejus ope se degebit  
Et pio suffragio.

Nam pro tali blasphemia  
Poena gehennae nimia  
Et divini nominis

Offensio quo quum horum  
Clausa janua coelorum  
Perpetui criminis

Out of the great number of university sermons, preached on the subject of the Immaculate Conception, I want to select some extracts—from those of Matthew of Cracow, Jan Wigandów and Mikolaj z Blonia (all three before the decree of the Council of Basle) and of Michal z Pyskowic (after that decree), for the simple reason that I have these particular volumes to hand.

The first-named, Matthew, was born at Cracow in the year 1335 and became, in 1357, a university professor at Prague : the university of Cracow was not founded until 1364. Matthew was subsequently Rector of Heidelberg University, later an intermediary between Emperor and Pope, and eventually Bishop of Worms. The added dignity of the cardinalate he quietly declined. He was a prolific writer on theological subjects and a very famous preacher. In the particular address to which I am referring he cannot resist turning back to the revelations of St. Bridget whose cause of canonization was, incidentally, so strongly urged and carried through by his efforts. The mention of the saint is interesting for a number of her prophecies were directed against the Teutonic Knights who waged an almost continual war with the Poles. In 1338 they were condemned by the Papal tribunal in Warsaw, and in 1410—two years after the date of this sermon—they were decisively beaten by the Polish armies.

The theme of the address gives us a good idea of the theological question that was then being debated. Was our Lady “*immaculata aut sanctificata*”? Was she immaculately conceived or was she sanctified after conception? Beginning with the text, “*Exsurget virga ex Israel*,” the preacher insists upon the duty of honouring the Blessed Virgin.

Virga—virgo Maria fuit,  
Plana per innocentiae puritatem,  
Gracilis per sublimem humilitatem,  
Flexibilis per liberalem benignitatem.

Dealing with the first of these three points, Matthew argues that the purity of the Blessed Virgin is twofold : (a) through her sanctification on earth ; (b) through her glory in heaven. This second aspect is set aside by the preacher as providing a theme more suitable for the feast of the Assumption. Our Lady’s sanctification on earth may also be considered from two different points of view. She was *sanctified* : (a) in her conception in the womb ; (b) in her motherhood of the God-man. Once again, the second consideration is left undeveloped because it would be dealt with more fittingly on the feast of the Annunciation.

This first sanctification was then a matter of heated discussion in theological circles. Was one to proclaim that Mary was "sanctified" at the moment of conception or in the instant of her soul's creation or even later? Matthew decides for the first moment of conception and so prior to the creation of her soul—to employ the distinction customary in the Middle Ages. This is a declaration of immaculate conception, of complete immunity from the consequences of original sin: and on this point Matthew appeals to the authority of St. Anselm of Canterbury. He answers the objections of the Thomists, and himself adopts the teaching of Duns Scotus which professed to prove this special privilege of our Lady from Holy Scripture. Especially striking and strong are the passages in the sermon which introduce the Old Testament types pre-figuring the Blessed Virgin. In the second half of his address Matthew insists upon the duty of keeping the feast of the Immaculate Conception.

Matthew is cited as an authority by Jan Wigandów, a professor of Cracow University, in a sermon on the same subject. Jan Wigandów was, in any case, a conscientious scholar of considerable reputation. His book of homilies for Sundays and Feast-days, composed in 1415, had a remarkable vogue, and at the time of Luther it played an important rôle in Eastern and Central Europe. St. Jan Kanty (from Kenty in Silesia), a younger colleague of Wigandów on the Cracow University staff, published and disseminated many of Wigandów's sermons on our Lady.

Another university professor of this period was Mikolaj Pszczółka z Blonia. He had made the whole of his studies in Poland and was afterwards a Canon in Warsaw. He composed and published a book of homilies which was widely used in other countries, particularly in Germany. It is perhaps worth noting that in the German editions of his works (*Sermones*, 1494; *De Sanctis*, 1495) the lives of all Polish saints were omitted.<sup>1</sup> This colleague of St. Jan Kanty commences one of his sermons on the Mother of God with the text, "Pulchra sicut luna." Jesus is the sun, Mary the moon. Telling of the beauty and virtues of the Holy Name of Mary, he proceeds to declare his own opinion. He holds the doctrine of the Immaculate

<sup>1</sup> By way of comparison we would point to the great work on the Saints, published in 1579 by the famous Polish Jesuit Piotr Skarga. This includes biographies and appreciations of all the German saints. For his lives of the English and Scottish saints Father Skarga relied on his correspondence with Blessed Edmund Campion and on Sanders' work "De Visibili Monarchia Ecclesiae."

Conception and stoutly defends this belief against what he terms the obstinate disbelief of his and its adversaries. Their fear that our Lady would thereby be placed upon the same level as her Son is—he argues—without foundation. The doctrine of our Lady's conception without sin is, in no sense, derogatory to God and in no way belittles the conception of Jesus Christ which, of course, was fuller and far more perfect than that of Mary. Precisely how this preacher represented to himself the Immaculate Conception, and on what special moment he wished to place special emphasis, is evident from the second part of this address. "Mary was beautiful in the moment of her own conception ; more beautiful in the instant of the conception of Christ ; and most beautiful of all, when she was assumed into heaven." As to the moment of this first beauty he is quite explicit. It was that moment when her soul entered into her body, when—like a new moon—she was all enlightened through sanctifying grace and entirely freed from every stain or shadow of original sin. This is not, of course, the doctrine of the dogmatic definition, the Constitution "*Ineffabilis Deus*" of 1854, with which, as we have seen, Matthew of Cracow was already in agreement.

Shortly after the date of this sermon, namely on September 17th, 1439, the Council of Basle, after two years of debate and discussion, declared itself in favour of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. When it gave this decision, the Council was no longer œcumenical but it should be remembered that the question was debated and introduced prior to the date of the Bull of dissolution of the Council ("*Doctoris Gentium*" : September 18th, 1437).

The opponents of the doctrine in Poland insisted that the decision of the Council was an act of revenge of a schismatical council, directed against certain individuals and certain religious orders which had consistently argued against the doctrine. The situation was complicated since the religious bodies concerned were divided in their attitude towards the Council, some of them opposing it and its actions, while others supported it.

In Poland practically all the clergy accepted to the full this declaration of the Immaculate Conception. Associations of priests were established under our Lady's special patronage, with Mary Immaculate as their protectress. Hymns and verses were spread far and wide. One example, the Latin stanzas of Wacław Ubogi, was given earlier in this article.

It was this decision concerning the Immaculate Conception that may well have been the chief reason why the professors of Cracow University upheld the cause of Eugenius IV. This is, at least, the excuse I would offer for my own countrymen from Upper Silesia, such as the Rector, Jan Wieniawa Elgot, Pawel de Pyskowic, and Wawrzyuiec de Racibórz. Without some explanation of the kind, it is difficult to understand how these professors, including St. Jan Kanty and the profound mystic Jan Wieniawa, could have been for so long without proper knowledge and orientation. Only one protest was registered, that of Professor Ulryk, but he protested, not actually against the schismatical character of the Council but against the declaration on the Immaculate Conception.

After the Council of Basle we have to hand the sermons of Pawel de Pyskowic. He appeals, as did Matthew of Cracow, to the writings of St. Anselm but argues principally from the Basle decree. Drawing a parallel with the twofold conception of every man ("maritalis" and "personalis"), he drags in the authority of St. Augustine and other authors to prove the Immaculate Conception. His ultimate statement is, however, that "*corpus virginis morbidum mansit usque ad . . . infusionem animae inclusive*," that is, it is not in conformity with the later and final decision of Pius IX.

From the second half of the fifteenth century onwards there is abundant evidence of the strong attachment of Poland and the Polish people to this doctrine. More and more churches were consecrated to our Lady, under this special title; in open market places statues and monuments were erected; the universities (for, in the sixteenth century, Wilno became a second university centre) had their confraternities. King Wladyslaw IV (1632-48) instituted the Order of the Immaculate Conception. The City Council of Lwów forwarded to the Pope a hundred arguments against the heretical adversaries of this doctrine. There still exists—its normal centre is in Warsaw—a literary archconfraternity of the Immaculate Conception, including among famous members of the past the Polish kings, Wladyslaw IV, Jan Kazimierz, Michal Wisniowiecki and Jan Sobieski. There were also, of course, the hundreds of Marian sodalities which exercised such a profound and lasting influence on Poland's intellectual and spiritual life through their members, many of them kings, princes, senators and bishops.

In the sixteenth century the development of devotion to our Lady's Immaculate Conception was, in a particular manner,

the work of two Polish Jesuits, Piotr Skarga and Jakób Wujek. Both of them were closely associated with King Stephen Batory. Father Skarga was a man of eminence. He was the first rector of the university of Wilno and promoted the reunion of the Ruthenian Church which was solemnized in 1596 at Brześć. He was court preacher under King Zygmunt III, and found time, in addition to his multifarious work, to publish many books, including a "History of the Church" together with "Lives of the Saints." He is the greatest preacher that Poland has ever produced. Of his more than forty works many have been re-issued in modern Poland and, a short while ago, a volume of his collected sermons was published in an English translation. Throughout these sermons the thought of Mary, Immaculately Conceived, is very prominent.

His confrere, Father Jakób Wujek, is best known for his admirable Polish version of the Bible. He was the author also of books of homilies and of several apologetical volumes. He composed too a series of "Godzinki" (Hours of Devotion in honour of the Immaculate Conception). Thenceforward we can trace the influence of these prayers and hymns throughout Polish history. Sienkiewicz introduces them into his novels as camp songs chanted by the Polish soldiers. And Sienkiewicz's account is true to reality. For these hymns are not merely melodious; they are genuine poetry, with an interior piety and a clarity of expression that are remarkable. These love songs to the Immaculate Virgin lay a strange and marvellous spell across the human spirit. I remember so well from my own school days that many of my fellow students, who had been partially "germanized" and had fallen away from their Catholic practice, would come back to church to join in the singing of this "breviary of Mary." And frequently they recovered their ancient faith and devotion. These noble songs to the honour of the Immaculate Virgin and Mother are still heard—so reliable report assures us—on the distant steppes of Russia, where are so many of our exiled fellow Poles, as well as among the Polish people of Silesia—a splendid proof, not only of the cultural strength of the Catholic faith but also of the love of the Polish nation for its heavenly Patroness and Queen.

✠ JÓZEF GAWLIŃA,  
Bishop of Mariamne.

## CATHOLICS AND THE B.B.C.

[The writer of this article wishes to express his gratitude to the Right Reverend T. Leo Parker, Bishop of Northampton, and to the Reverend Dr. J. W. Welch, the Director of Religious Broadcasting for the B.B.C. Both have kindly read through this article in manuscript and have made a number of valuable comments. The Bishop of Northampton was, for many years, one of the two Catholic representatives on the B.B.C.'s Central Religious Advisory Council.]

I WANT in this article to comment upon one aspect of broadcasting, in practice upon one side of the work of the B.B.C. I am not speaking in a general way of broadcasting, in so far as it might and indeed does raise problems of Catholic interest but of what is termed more strictly religious broadcasting.

Consequently, I refuse to be tempted by certain succulent red herrings. It used to be argued, for example, that prior to this war the B.B.C. talks department was far too partial to "pink" and "pale red" speakers. There may be truth in this accusation: I feel there is at least some truth in it. But then the talks department might reply that the so-called intelligentsia which provided speakers for such talks, was itself over-inclined to "pinkness." To-day the charge is made that some of the B.B.C. variety programmes are vulgar, and vulgar in the double sense that they represent the lower music hall and include a number of songs and jokes that are decidedly bluish. A high-brow music-hall—they might reply—is a contradiction in terms. If there is to be variety, it must be the hearty, romping, more or less healthy, not too refined, variety of the ordinary variety artist, whose spiritual home is Wigan or the Old Kent Road, not Bloomsbury or Kensington. Once again, there is truth in both charge and reply.

Lastly, questions might be put concerning some of the broadcasts to foreign countries. Qualified listeners have stated that the effect of our broadcasting to certain countries in Europe has been negligible or even positively harmful. And the reason given for this judgment is that the broadcasts have been addressed to Left elements and couched in Left phraseology: they may have been appreciated in Left circles but elsewhere they have been rejected and deplored. The question of such propaganda to European countries that are Catholic or mainly Catholic in their history and tradition cannot but interest—and, I am afraid, at times alarm—Catholics here and throughout the Commonwealth.

These are just three of those proverbial herrings which it might be entertaining and instructive to follow—on some other occasion. For the moment, we shall confine ourselves to broadcasting that is more or less definitely religious and so comes under the control of the B.B.C. religious department.

To start with, I imagine that few people realize how much time is allotted to such religious broadcasts. Before the war the situation was rather different. Then there were several regional programmes that sometimes coincided and overlapped, and at others retained an individuality of their own. A number of religious services were broadcast on Sundays, both morning and evening. You could switch from one regional station to another and select. A Catholic service might be put on the air, this week from London, a week or so later from Manchester, and shortly afterwards from Glasgow. Naturally, greater freedom could be allowed in the character and arrangement of such services. But since the beginning of the war there have been only two full programmes—those of the Home Service and the Forces—with a certain amount of broadcasting in English to the Dominions and the United States.<sup>1</sup>

Within this reduced framework are included thirty-seven periods per week that may be called religious. Some of the periods are very short, e.g. the five minutes talk from 7.55 to 8 a.m. every week-day morning, and the five minutes daily service in English for Australasia, Africa and America. On Sunday there are eleven religious periods: a morning service of three quarters of an hour; an evening period of forty minutes; an overseas service in English for half an hour (at present 9.30—10 a.m.), which is recorded and goes out altogether four times during the same day—to Australasia, the East, Africa, and the Americas; a short Forces service at 11 a.m., lasting a quarter of an hour, with a religious talk on the same wave-length from 2.50—3 p.m.; an Epilogue in both Home and Forces programme; a religious Children's hour, ending at 6 p.m.; and three other items, including at present, a fifteen minutes talk at 4.45 p.m. and half an hour of community hymn-singing.

<sup>1</sup> For some time after the outbreak of war there was only one programme broadcast for home purposes. A second programme, for the Forces, was added later. When no alternative was provided for the home listener, it was natural that Catholics should be willing to forego any broadcasting in Latin. Apart from war conditions, it can be stated—I think—that ecclesiastical authorities do not particularly favour the broadcasting of High Mass, except on special occasions. There are reasons—other than technical—why the broadcasting of Mass is not always desirable.

During a normal week there are : the five minute talk or morning prayers (these now alternate, week by week) just before the 8 o'clock news ; a daily week-day service, from 10.15 to 10.30 a.m. ; a night service, without sermon, on Tuesdays and Saturdays, and, with an address, on Thursdays, starting at 10.15 or 10.20 p.m. There are in addition : a weekly service for elementary schools, intended for children who are assembled in some school hall (the hymns being sung and the prayers recited in unison with the broadcast hymns and prayers), a lecture on Scripture suitable for the Sixth Forms of public and secondary schools ; and a Wednesday evening talk on modern problems, seen from a Christian's point of view.

For a Catholic most of these services and talks will have a Protestant ethos. This is inevitable. Yet it is not easy to say how many of them would be regarded by a Free Churchman as definitely Church of England. Many of them are certainly intended to be undenominational, at least as between the Church of England and the Free Churches. The short 7.55 to 8 a.m. talk, known as "Lift up your Hearts" is clearly not denominational though its accent and colour must vary with the speaker. The week-day morning service has been conceived on non-denominational lines : and the short daily service for overseas is generally Protestant rather than specifically Anglican. For the Thursday evening service, preachers are invited from various denominations, and quite a number of these talks have been given by Catholic priests. The same can be said of the Sunday service for overseas though this is usually taken from a church.

At a meeting, soon after the outbreak of war, of the B.B.C.'s Central Religious Advisory Council which has normally two Catholic members, it was generally agreed that emphasis should be placed on Christian unity rather than on religious differences, and that the B.B.C.'s religious broadcasts should stress this unity, and not regional or denominational differences. A Catholic representative attended the meeting and agreed, naturally, to the dropping of Latin in Sunday broadcast services. At the time, only one programme was envisaged. Catholics can see that it was a natural decision to take though, on the strictly religious plane, they can themselves contribute very little in this particular matter. Fortunately, the Catholic position is reasonably understood by the Advisory Council and still more by the Director of Religious Broadcasting and his staff.

This decision of the Advisory Council must not be misinterpreted. It did not mean, and has not in fact meant, that religious services and talks are being used for national propaganda purposes. The present religious director, Dr. J. W. Welch, is very scrupulous in this regard. A religious talk may have, incidentally, considerable propaganda value, if it is given by a sincere man who insists that moral principles must be brought into the very fabric of public and social life, and can show how this is utterly ignored and repudiated by the Nazis. If our cause is just, a certain propaganda value will be the by-product of a religious talk : it must not be its main purpose or intention. But I do not think it could be justly stated that the B.B.C. religious department had made religion in any manner subservient to national or propaganda needs.

So much for the list of talks and services that are being broadcast. A further question at once presents itself. For what audience are these talks and services intended ? For the talks the answer is simple enough : they are for anybody and everybody who may care to listen, for churchgoers and non-churchgoers : they do not provide an alternative to church-going as the broadcast services might appear to do. But actually these broadcast services are not intended to take people away from church. The week-day services are held at times (10.15—10.30 a.m. ; 10.10—10.20 p.m.) when there would not normally be services in Anglican or Nonconformist churches ; indeed, except for the coincidence of the morning service with a Catholic Mass or Anglican Communion service, when there would be no church services at all. The Sunday morning service is broadcast from 9.30—10.15 a.m., that is before the normal Church of England or Free Church Service which people might attend : the evening service is from 8—8.40 p.m., when the average churchgoer would be at home again. Their general intention is, I think, to supplement what the churchgoer has had from his own church or chapel and, still more, to appeal to the non-churchgoer. This explanation is, in one sense, an answer to the criticism, made by Anglicans as well as Catholics, against B.B.C. church broadcasts, namely that they are too indefinite and too undenominational. The charge is not without foundation : its explanation and its excuse are, I imagine, that these broadcasts are meant to appeal to a very undenominationally minded audience, that great mass of English people who have been brought up without definite ideas about Christianity

but who, by a kind of tradition, as well as natural reason, have retained a belief in God, feel that they ought to be respectful to the name and person of Christ, and maintain some strong if incomplete notions of moral conduct and behaviour. To this class of listener must of course be added the many invalids and older persons who could not well attend their former churches.

A short time ago there appeared a leader in *The Church Times* which took the B.B.C. very seriously to task. While allowing that religious broadcasts were much appreciated in Anglican circles and did considerable good, it complained that they had done nothing to popularize the Church of England's liturgical services. *The Church Times*, being a High Church organ, was presumably using the term "liturgical" in a High Church sense. It appeared, however, to miss some fundamental points and not to be conscious of the very limited possibilities of religious broadcasting. Leaving aside the possible development of television (this is at any rate delayed until after the war) a broadcast service can appeal only to the ear. Effective religious broadcasting is thus confined to speech and music, and it is essential that there shall be no pauses of any duration in a broadcast. Otherwise attention is lost at once. A Catholic can always listen to a broadcast of High Mass or Benediction and fill in whatever intervals may occur—by means of imagination. He can visualise what is happening, can transfer himself, in spirit, to the church from which the Mass or Benediction is being relayed. Even then, I doubt whether the effect is a happy one. Quite apart from the more religious appeal of a High Mass, so much depends on sight, on the sense of being in a church with others and of sharing in an act of worship and sacrifice: the microphone can reproduce merely the effect of sound. Those who are not Catholics are naturally in a far less favourable position. Most of them do not know what is happening. They may enjoy the music, are left puzzled by the necessary pauses: and religiously, the effect will be small or negligible.

There will always be special or solemn occasions when a broadcast Mass is appropriate—at Easter or Pentecost or on Christmas Eve at midnight. Here it should be recalled that the B.B.C. have broadcast a midnight Mass at Christmas, both last year and the year before, and intend to do so again this coming Christmas. As far as I know, the suggestion came from themselves and not from any Catholic source.

Apart from such special occasions, the relaying of High Mass has several grave difficulties. Some of them have been referred to already. Another is the very evident fact that members of a Catholic family who are in the habit of going to Mass regularly on Sunday mornings, have no time to listen to the wireless. A mother of a family may be at the 8 o'clock Mass : she must hurry back to see that the children are ready to go to Mass at 10 o'clock. Let us be lenient with the father and mark him down for Mass at eleven or even twelve. This all means that the radio will be remarkably silent in a Catholic household on Sunday morning.

There is one suggestion which might be made—scarcely to the B.B.C. but to some Catholic Radio Station in Europe after the war. This is that High Mass—or, for that matter, even Low Mass—might be broadcast, with a commentary that would explain the action and significance of the Mass as it proceeded. This would be much easier with television and in any case can hardly be considered a practical proposition till Europe is again at peace.

Very well, if it be agreed that there are great difficulties standing in the way of broadcast liturgical services, what follows? We are thrown back upon the combination of music and speech. In other words, the most effective service for broadcasting is one which has little place in Catholic worship. In this matter, the Church of England has certain advantages. It has concentrated on hymn and psalm singing and on the recitation of prayers. For Catholics the one and only Sunday morning service is the Mass, while the normal evening service consists of some devotional office or the recitation of the Rosary, a possible Vespers or Compline (almost always in Latin) with sermon and Benediction. Vespers and Compline would broadcast well enough : in fact, they have both been broadcast in the Catholic First Friday service (3.30—3.50 p.m.) that takes place every month. The one difficulty, when one thinks in terms of a general listening public, is that, being in Latin, these portions of the Divine Office, will scarcely be understood outside the Catholic body.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Actually, Compline has been broadcast, in English, from a Catholic church. The general agreement, not to make substantial use of Latin in services on the air, at any rate during the war, does not apply to the First Friday service (3.30—3.50 p.m.) that is taken every month from a Catholic church or chapel. Now that the Forces programme provides an alternative, there is not the same need to stick rigorously to English : in any case, the service is announced explicitly as "Roman Catholic." Vespers, Compline and Benediction have formed part of these First Friday services.

Consequently—far more urgently than in pre-war days—one is forced back to the distinction between church-services and studio-services. The church-service remains exactly what it has always been—our own Catholic Mass in the mornings and, in the evening, some more or less traditional service. The evening allows, of course, greater latitude since the forms of its devotions are not rigid and could be adapted and arranged. A sermon broadcasts easily enough : and, with a little care, the pauses in Benediction can be dealt with successfully : an organ voluntary during the actual blessing will carry forward the ear and attention of a listener. There remains one war-time difficulty, that of the use of Latin in the one and only religious service broadcast on the Sunday evening. However, as the Latin is almost entirely a matter of singing—the “ *O Salutaris Hostia* ” and the “ *Tantum Ergo* ” are the chief items—this difficulty might be overcome. In at least two recent overseas broadcasts the Latin Benediction hymns have been included.

It might be stated that the main purpose of a studio service, conducted by a Catholic, is not so much to reproduce a Catholic church service as to get some Catholic teaching across to a more general public—in what would be recognized, from the hymns and prayers used—as a Catholic setting. It is, in one sense, an artificial service but it is pieced together from thoroughly Catholic elements. It has in mind a far wider audience and a religiously less instructed audience that would be met with in any church. Therefore, a Catholic talk on the air should appear fully Catholic to any Catholic listener and at the same time be straightforward, not too technical in expression, and meant to appeal to the ordinary public. A parallel might be drawn with the methods employed on a Catholic Evidence Guild platform in Hyde Park or elsewhere. The speaker there does not assume that his audience knows much about Catholicism : he is there to answer queries and to give simple explanations in a form suitable for that particular crowd. A studio address is in much the same position.

There is another point that deserves attention. It could be argued not only that liturgical services do not broadcast effectively but even that no church service is really suited to this new technique. It is true that something of the atmosphere of a church can be conveyed to the listener at home. A certain impression of spaciousness and reverence may accompany both singing and address. But it is doubtful how far this is merely an imaginative interpretation of the echoes and overtones that

are more noticeable in a church broadcast. Psychologically, the pulpit preacher who is broadcasting at the same time, is in a somewhat awkward position. He is trying to do two things at once, to preach to a congregation there in front of him and to address an unseen audience, very different in character, through the microphone. On which of the two is he to concentrate? I have heard the engineer in charge of an outside broadcast tell a preacher to ignore the microphone and talk to his people as though he were not broadcasting at all. It may be sound advice, but I hardly think so. If you could and did ignore the microphone and throw yourself into an ordinary sermon, there would—in the first place—be several small technical difficulties. You would be sure to turn away from the microphone, varying your distance from it, turning your head to left and right, and thus interfere with the smoothness of your sermon from a broadcast point of view. If you remain very microphone-conscious, you will just talk into it: the congregation will be unable to hear what you say: it will mean, in fact, that you are trying to imagine that the church is really a studio. It will scarcely be a pulpit sermon at all. Most probably, the preacher will be torn between these two desires and aims, he will try to let the congregation hear what he is saying, and yet take care that he faces the microphone all the time, not varying volume and emphasis too much. The result is that it will be a poor church sermon and possibly not very successful as broadcast.

A further difficulty, closely connected with the above, is that a microphone is a very sensitive instrument. A strong volume of sound can be, to some extent, controlled, but it is almost impossible to soften those big changes of voice and emphasis which may be necessary in a sermon preached in a church of some size. And, if these changes are very evident in the broadcast as it reaches the ordinary listener, the sermon may appear artificial to him, or it may seem too obviously a sermon whereas what he is wanting is a human talk.

These various statements have been made not in any categorical spirit but rather as a suggestion or, if you like, as a modest challenge. B.B.C. officials will tell you that the best preachers are frequently the worst of broadcasters, and that the problems of the broadcast sermon have not yet been properly solved. For the present, it seems that we must resign ourselves to the following distinction. There are some church services which do not broadcast effectively—and this for several

reasons. Mass is represented only very incompletely through sound. Imagination—that is the instructed imagination of a Catholic—can fill in the many inevitable gaps and pauses in the actual transmission. For the ordinary listener the measure of a High Mass broadcast will be that simply of the music sung, and even this measure will be affected by the intervals between the various sung portions. Benediction is an easier question, since with a little arrangement pauses can be avoided. An evening or a First Friday service can be broadcast without much difficulty—as also could Vespers and Compline—but they will sound as though they came from a church as, in all probability, will the pulpit address. At present the afternoon First Friday service explicitly for Catholics, and any Sunday morning Catholic service that is destined for overseas come from a church, sound as if they came from a church, and are, I think, meant so to sound. They are a relaying of a church service—for the benefit of those who could not go then to church and for the general interest of sympathetic listeners.

The problems of a studio service are rather different. There is a certain arbitrariness in the selection of hymns and prayers. These correspond to no Catholic service, actually known in the Church's normal experience. The hymns and prayers are naturally taken from Catholic sources but the general impression is of something improvised. Some Catholics no doubt consider them almost Protestant in general character. But the studio hymns are well and reverently sung; and for the prayers, that is the responsibility of the individual broadcaster. Where this type of broadcast can and often does gain, is in the sermon. You are not in two minds, you are no longer trying to satisfy a double audience. You can concentrate on the one public, the unseen listeners. You speak more quietly, there are no problems of church acoustics to overcome. The result is, or should be, that what you say comes over in a more natural manner. I do not mean that a studio sermon should be just a "chat": it can, and should, retain just something of the dignity and manner of a pulpit address; but not too much of it. For you have in mind a very general audience to whom you are endeavouring to talk in a way they can understand and in language that will not put them off.

There is one suggestion that may be made here. Catholic priests often find it difficult to arrange a suitable studio service for the Sunday morning or evening. They are practically limited to choosing hymns and prayers, over and above the

sermon. A broadcast sermon should not last more than 16 or 18 minutes : 20 minutes would be, I imagine, the outside limit. There remain something like 25 minutes to be filled judiciously. One method of arranging such a service is to take some general religious theme—e.g., adoration, praise, gratitude to God, sorrow and contrition, the spirit of Christmas, Lent or Paschaltide, faith or confidence or charity, and so on. Alternately, one might make use of two or three themes in one service, as, for example, the four ends of prayer. Prayers and hymns will then be selected in harmony with this general theme. The difficulty is less noticeable in overseas services which are confined strictly to half an hour, or in a Thursday night service of twenty minutes : even here, however, the use of some theme will give point and meaning to the service and its particular message.

The problems of religious broadcasting are considerable, and they are fully recognized by those in charge of the religious broadcasts of the B.B.C. What I have attempted to do in this article is to discuss them, in so far as they affect Catholic services and Catholics. At the present moment we are in a rather peculiar position. There are just the two full programmes, with one religious service on the Sunday morning and evening : there is no alternative for the would-be listener as there was of course before the war. It is not unnatural (under these circumstances) that when one of these services is conducted by a Catholic priest, he should be asked to make English the language of the service while keeping its Catholic spirit. In the strictly religious sphere it is impossible for Catholics to co-operate with non-Catholics—in the manner, for example, in which Anglicans and Free Churchmen are co-operating. What one can do—and what the B.B.C. would, I am sure, admit that we have done—is to avoid raising controversy which is not called for and to speak positively of the Catholic faith and outlook. Those Catholic speakers who have had experience of the B.B.C. religious department during the war will at once pay tribute, on their side, to the courtesy, friendliness and real desire for sincere understanding which that department conspicuously shows.

One last word must be added concerning that field of thought and outlook in which there has been a notable development of co-operation between Catholics and members of the Church of England together with Free Churchmen. That field, as is now well known, lies outside the province of strict religious

belief, and consists of the application of moral standards, with all that Catholics understand by the principles of natural justice and the Natural Law, to the problems of social, public and international life. Though the exact framework in which it is hoped that such co-operation will formally continue, has not yet been sufficiently elaborated, great notice has been taken—all over the country—of the many large Joint Meetings which have been held in many of Great Britain's principal cities. The work of the Sword of the Spirit and of various local Christian Councils in inspiring and organizing these large meetings is too familiar to need comment here. This spirit of co-operation has shown itself also in various series of talks, broadcast under the aegis of the B.B.C. religious department. There were three talks from the Secretary of the Sword of the Spirit in December of last year : a Catholic priest spoke in a series of talks on education and also in a subsequent series on the anti-Christian character of Nazi-ism : two of the four addresses on social reconstruction which commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of "*Rerum Novarum*" were from the pen and voice of another Catholic priest : and on the latest day of National Prayer an address of the Vice-President of the Sword of the Spirit was read and broadcast in the afternoon, after a sermon of His Eminence the Cardinal in the morning. This feeling that we should co-operate with others when we honestly can co-operate has affected and influenced a large number of Catholics : and, granted full frankness and a clarity of outlook, it is an admirable movement. And it is playing its part in Catholic relations with the B.B.C.

JOHN MURRAY.

---

To whatsoever man attains, forthwith that to which he has attained becomes of little worth to him. Other things begin to be desired, other fond things are hoped for ; and when they come, whatever they be, they become of little worth. Hold fast then to God, for He can never be of little worth, since nothing is more beautiful than He. These things become of small esteem because they cannot endure, because they are not what He is. For nought sufficeth thee, O my soul, save He that created thee. Whatsoever else thou obtainest is without worth : for He alone can fully suffice thee who made thee after His own image.

St. Augustine. Sermon 125.

## THREE PEACE PLANS

THE fundamental paradox of our times is that people have never loathed war more than they do to-day, that governments have never claimed to be so directly representative of the wills of the people, and yet that the lives of the present generation are being lived under the shadow or within the actual embrace of war more thorough, more extensive, more devastating than mankind has ever known in the past. How then are we to account for the fact that rulers, who consider themselves, even in non-democratic countries, trustees of the people who universally hate war and cry for peace, make war, to all intents and purposes continuously, whether it be shooting war or the white war that precedes it? Until we have satisfactorily answered that question, we shall not even understand how an era of peace could dawn for our generation.

The plain answer that rulers do not in fact bother their heads about the wishes of those in whose name and with whose consent they rule does not seem to take us very far, nor is it obviously correct. During the last war two constructive ideas gradually came to govern the minds of those who sought to establish an era of genuine peace. One was the establishment of a League of Nations. The other was the spread of democratic régimes in which, as it was thought, the self-governing peoples would have the opportunity of exerting their will to peace on their governors. Neither idea proved in practice to be a success, but the second was perhaps even more of a failure than the first. The most manifest example of its failure was the subsequent history of Germany. Democracy in Germany, so far from guaranteeing that the people's will to peace would prove effective in restraining an elected Government from seeking or risking war, opened the way for the establishment of a popular dictatorship—with a working-man as dictator—the policy of which was openly based upon the use of overwhelming force, not only in external relations but within the country itself. But Germany was not the only country in which this phenomenon occurred. In Russia the overthrow of the Czar was greeted by Mr. Lloyd George as the first example of the triumph of the wish of the Allies, that the war should usher in the rule of the people. Yet the fall of the Czar led to the establishment of another dictatorship whose avowed object was the spread of the doctrine of

violent class-war, a dictatorship which moreover came to establish itself as yet another highly armed national State with warlike designs upon its neighbours. And one could point out similar developments in most European countries. Even in pacific and very democratic France the fear of Germany kept the nation militaristic, even though internal dissensions made French militarism in the end ineffective. Only in Britain, of the larger European countries, could it be fairly said that the people's hatred of war affected national policy so that the country positively exerted itself for the cause of peace, and actually made certain national sacrifices to that end. But even here in England rulers were at bottom more concerned as to the most effective method of maintaining British power and influence than to work for peace for its own sake. Was Britain to preserve her security by an expensive and unpopular policy of rearmament and alliances or by relying on the League of Nations, and encouraging general disarmament? The arguments in favour of the second alternative were so attractive that the issue was never in doubt. Still, even if the economic advantage of the League policy for the defence of an Empire that covered the face of the globe had not been so obvious, the will of the people would have sufficed to force British Governments to the pacific course.

It may seem that what I have already said involves an emendation of the first part of the paradox, namely that at no time have the people loathed war more and been more determined to outlaw it. Is it not the case that whether they loathed it or not, they came to fall in love with war as an instrument of policy in Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain and even Great Britain in the end? Only perhaps in France could it be said that the popular dislike of war finally defeated the governmental tradition—and this outcome is more generally attributed to political incompetence and intrigue than to any pacific idealism. Yet the fact remains that if you journeyed across Europe at any time up to the outbreak of war and questioned individual after individual, you would have obtained a very heavy vote against resort to war as a proper or desirable means of remedying the situation. Even in Germany Hitler's popularity rested largely on the way he always appeared able to *avoid* war in pursuing a policy of national renaissance. Hitler himself did not openly glorify war. On the contrary he always spoke of it with dislike. Only Mussolini, whose mind was considerably influenced by Marinetti and the queer band of Italian futurists,

actually praised war for its own sake, but it is highly doubtful how far any Italians really agreed with him, or how far, for that matter, Mussolini who in extreme crises exerted himself to the utmost to avoid a major war believed in his own words. And, strangely enough, one can at least hazard the view that in the end the only peoples who came clearly to prefer war to the maintenance of affairs as they were, were the British and the Poles. The Poles in the end preferred war to any alteration in their frontiers—an alteration which they subconsciously judged to be the beginning of the end of Poland. The British in the end preferred war to the rapidly growing threat of German power—and it is important to note that the most genuinely pacific people became the people most completely resigned to war as the only possible policy. In the end it was Mr. Chamberlain's umbrella which turned out to possess the sharpest point.

From all this we can deduce that the popular will against a major war is not proof against two differing, though generally interdependent, sets of circumstances. The first is a national desire of aggrandisement or expansion based upon the cleverly-led exploitation of a genuine grievance. The second is an imminent and serious threat to the existing order, upon which depend national prestige and even security.

Let us take the first set of circumstances. The German people and even Hitler himself did not want war as such : it is even arguable that the British people, just before the outbreak of war, actually wanted war more than the German. Yet it is quite evident that the whole policy of Hitler was blatantly aggressive, just as the policy of Britain was pacific. Hitler's real mission was to put Germany back on the map, and, given the various German grievances as an excuse for getting started on this policy, no man could tell how much of the map Germany would require before she considered herself satisfied. And in this policy Hitler had the ardent backing of a large majority of his people. If Hitler and the German people did not actually want war, it was solely because they hoped to achieve their ends without, at any rate, a major war. Throughout they went to the extreme limits of risking war and finally they provoked it. Italy, it is worth noticing, whose grievances were far less serious than Germany's, actually backed out of war when the time came, and the Italian people were at length drawn into the war only because Mussolini miscalculated the effects of the over-running of France. For our purpose it is

worth noticing that, despite the manifest aggression of Hitlerism and Fascism and despite the very actual sense of national grievance—whether justifiable or not—there remained in fact in Germany and Italy a very clear popular hostility to the recourse to war itself. As I have said, Hitler's popularity largely rested on his skill in avoiding war, and German propaganda, for internal as well as external consumption, was directed towards proving that the Allies were responsible for the war. In other words it is extremely doubtful whether even a popular totalitarian dictatorship could safely embark on a policy of aggression, entailing the near risk of a major war, if the people cannot be persuaded that the nation has a deep grievance, affecting them in their social and economic status personally, and if a plausible case cannot be made out to show that if war were to come, it would be the fault of the parties against whom the grievances were felt.

Let us now take the second set of circumstances, where national security and prosperity, dependent on the maintenance of the existing order, seem to be seriously and immediately threatened.

This, of course, was the case of Britain and France. Though both were strongly pacific, the peoples of the two countries reacted somewhat differently. At the beginning the French people put greater faith than the British in a policy which involved the risk of war. France, despairing of collective guarantees, sought to maintain her security by essentially military means—just as Germany sought to recover her prestige by essentially military means. But when the French system of security, based on armaments and alliances, started to melt away before the eyes of Frenchmen, they gave the impression of losing heart altogether. They saw one bastion of French security after another disappear and when finally they had to depend upon an unprepared Britain and the Maginot Line, they only accepted war with great reluctance. We need not here enter into the causes of this French defeatism. For our purposes it is enough to establish that in fact the French people left alone would probably have accepted the German rebirth rather than suffer the consequences of war. Britain was never threatened in the way France was threatened. Her dominion was essentially maritime, colonial and economic, and the Nazi threat to this empire was, it could be argued, remote. On any sober calculation Britain stood to lose more by war, even a victorious war, than by Hitler gaining his immediate ends in

Europe. Yet Britain, after doing her utmost to maintain her position by pacific means, changed her attitude almost overnight. When Hitler, after the winter pogroms invaded Czechoslovakia, the British people almost to a man decided that, short of a miracle, nothing but the threat of war would stop Hitler. War in fact was considered preferable to any further extension of Hitler's power. Hence the unprecedented guarantee to Poland given by the half-brother of the statesman who refused the far less dangerous commitments of the Geneva Protocol in 1924. Though there was undoubtedly genuine altruism and moral feeling in this courageous attitude, the determining cause was certainly the conviction that the security of a great and long-standing empire—a way of life and action that had become part of the Britisher—was now threatened. And the plain fact is that but for the will of the British people to incur the risks and sufferings of a terrible war rather than go into a decline and see a new and unfamiliar world arise around them Hitler would have got all he wanted without a war. And twice at least since the war began it has been this same iron will which has come between Hitler and a peace which would leave him virtually master of Europe.

A long introduction to the main theme of this study has been needed, since it is clearly of little use to consider any principles of the future peace except against the experiences of the past. As we have discovered to our cost the best laid plans can come to nought if they fail to connect with the actual behaviour of men, and the peace-makers of to-morrow will at least have the advantage of being able to study and understand why in the concrete the Wilsonian scheme of peace was smashed to pieces so soon.

So far this war has produced three peace schemes, the Hitlerian, the Papal and the Anglo-American.

There is, we trust, no need to dwell on the Hitlerian, though it should be recognized that it is one of the possible ways of ensuring peace. The total domination by one great Power over an area of potential conflict is not a new thing in history, and indeed it is associated with one of the great ages of civilization, namely the sway of the Roman Empire when the Pax Romana flourished. Under such conditions, we may note in passing, the two sets of circumstances which induce people to support war may be removed. There is no one strong enough to challenge the existing order, and it is at least possible to conceive that the dominating Power should be enlightened enough to reduce

to a minimum the grievances of subject peoples. For that matter there are many people to-day who firmly believe that the best chance of peace in the future is an Anglo-Saxon peace of this type, though few have the courage openly to advocate it while the good-will of so many non-Anglo-Saxons is needed. However, we may take it for granted that Hitlerism is in any case not fitted to make a successful job of a Pax Romana. Moreover the task of maintaining order among many nationally conscious and fully civilized lands is of a very different order from the task that faced the Roman Empire.

We may therefore concentrate on the Papal peace and the Anglo-American peace adumbrated in the Atlantic Charter.

Some people may have wondered why the British Prime Minister and the American President, when seeking to proclaim a peace charter to the world, did not avail themselves of the points put forward by the only personage in the world who can claim at one and the same time full impartiality and the highest moral authority. There are no doubt many reasons, but the most obvious one is that, despite certain outward resemblances, the two schemes differ radically.

The Papal peace summarized in five points cannot be understood except in relation to the Papal Encyclical which preceded the declaration of those points and the Allocution given a year after them. When all three are taken together it will be seen that the Papal principles, as is but natural, are essentially an appeal to the conscience of Western man. The Encyclical exposes the fundamental reasons why our civilization has "caved-in." Those fundamental reasons, according to the Pope, are, first "the forgetfulness of that law of human solidarity and charity, which is dictated and imposed by our common origin and by the equality of rational nature in all men, to whatever people they belong," and, second, the divorce between the effective power of the increasingly authoritative will of the State and the unchanging law of God enshrined in natural reason and the Christian conscience. These errors are given practical expression by the Pope in a list of five premises or conditions for a new order enumerated in the Allocution which followed the five peace points. They are briefly : (1) triumph over the spirit of hatred and whatever breeds hatred (for example, propaganda) between nations ; (2) triumph over the spirit of distrust and suspicion caused by breach of treaties and the lying of diplomacy ; (3) triumph over the view that utility is the foundation of law and that

might is right ; (4) triumph over an economic order under which nations or individuals suffer unjustly to the advantage of others ; (5) triumph over putting self—whether the self of the nation or the self of the strong individual—first.

The famous five peace points cannot really be considered as more than the first broad basic applications to current conditions of an outlook that can only be fully appreciated in terms of the Christian moral order—and of these five, one sums up the spirit of that order with the caution that any agreement will be doomed to failure unless the rulers and peoples themselves become imbued with the spirit of goodwill and with a thirst and hunger for justice and universal love, with a sense of responsibility which measures human actions in accordance with the dictates of Divine right.

The other four points demand (1) the right to life and freedom of nations, big and small, powerful and weak with reparation—based on justice, not on the sword or by selfish arbitration—when this right has been destroyed ; (2) freedom from the slavery of armaments and the danger that force shall violate rather than defend rights ; (3) the reconstitution of international judicial institutions which will allow of revision and amendment of agreements ; and (4) the recognition of the needs and just demands of nations and peoples and racial minorities.

Summed up, the Papal peace may be said to demand the restoration of the status quo (though the status quo is of course compatible with the establishment of desirable improvements, as for example a Danubian or other federations), gradual common disarmament with the moral control of instruments of force, a much more flexible international authority, providing especially for peaceable changes demanded by the alteration of circumstances and much greater international sympathy with the interest in political, social and economic demands, whether of persons or of nations.

Though wrongs committed must be repaired in the light of justice, and not through one-sided force, the Pope clearly does not envisage a punitive peace, and he is content with the idea of overcoming the mistakes of the past by insisting on more flexible international institutions and greater regard for the various claims that may reasonably be made and which may from time to time alter. As compared with the Versailles settlement, the Pope criticizes any attempt to build up a military security for one set of nations as against another as well as

the idea that any immediate settlement can be erected into a virtually eternal system. History is a changing process and only disaster can result from setting up institutions which try to impose a permanent mould on a living process, petrifying life itself. It should be noted in passing that the defects of the Covenant in this respect were largely due to foolish compromises between workable British, American and French proposals. But the Pope himself proclaims the truth that even a fair and non-vindictive peace maintained by a more adaptable international machinery and a more intelligent understanding of changing processes will not solve the problem of peace unless a positive moral effort is made by people and by peoples' rulers to see one another as members of the same human family, equally created by God for equal moral destiny, and to give primacy to the moral law. This Papal appeal to the conscience contrasts with the politician's appeal to force.

If we try to think of this ideal in terms of past experience as we analysed it earlier on, we may note at once that the contemporary popular loathing for war and will for peace do to some extent correspond with the moral idealism of the Pope. The majority of ordinary people, as compared with their political leaders, do remember the unity of the human family and the common moral nature of man and they do protest against the unnecessary encroachments of arbitrary State power, just as they remain greatly sceptical of the political game, whether played nationally or internationally. But, as we have seen, they can easily be roused to support bellicose leaders and bellicose policies which skilfully exploit real grievances that are not pacifically remedied. And when those policies reach the stage of imperilling the prosperity or traditional position of existing States, the peoples of those States, however pacific, are generally ready to support a warlike resistance. Even so there is strong evidence that both these popular resorts to war are, on the whole, disliked, and it needs a good deal of artificial stimulant in the way of propaganda and a good deal of provocation to enlist popular support for war itself. In other words, we have to ask ourselves whether the maintenance of reasonable order and prosperity within States—for that, rather than mere democratic institutions is the condition for the will of the people being effective—and the institution of reasonably intelligent and adaptable international machinery to control the give and take of historical processes would not in fact ensure the maintenance of peace in modern

times? And would not this somewhat negative ambition be greatly strengthened by sincere, religious, cultural, social and economic efforts to build up popular consciousness of the interdependence of men and the essential equality of their destiny?

The Anglo-American peace, the principles of which are set forth in the Atlantic Charter, appears to be something of a compromise between the commonsense idealism of the Pope and the political realism of a *Pax Germanica*. The Charter holds out the hope of a more equitable and more flexible world order, but it insists that for an indeterminate period that order should be politically guaranteed by a monopoly of armaments in the hands of the non-aggressive Powers—in this point clashing with the principle, but not the practice of the Wilsonian Peace. This means the disarmament of Germany and Italy and it should mean the disarmament of Japan and those smaller countries, like Hungary and Rumania and possibly Spain, which have voluntarily aligned themselves with the Axis. And on the constructive side the Atlantic Charter seems to place more reliance on international economic improvements, by promoting freedom of trade and such economic conditions as will better the lot of the ordinary man, than on any general raising of the moral standard or the provision of any international judicial or arbitrating institutions.

If we examine these proposals in the light of past experience we shall not despair of the future; though we may conclude that the Anglo-American peace offers very much less hope than the Papal peace. Though the Pope insists on the reparation of injuries done to the rights of nations—and this would certainly involve the defeat of Hitlerism and the overthrow of the Nazi leaders—he clearly envisages peace terms in which both sides will be treated alike, a condition that is extremely hard to fulfil after the complete victory of one side. It is worth recalling that in the last war President Wilson was adamant about peace being negotiated before one side conquered the other up to the time when America entered the war, and, looking back, one may well wonder whether the Wilsonian peace would not in fact have succeeded had Wilson's original condition been fulfilled. Throughout Benedict XV worked for a negotiated peace. There can be no escaping the truth that the complete defeat of one side followed by the disarming of the conquered sows the seeds of a deep grievance which can later be exploited up to the point when the popular will against war is dangerous-

ly weakened. And the tragedy is that up to a point the severer the measures taken by the conqueror to ward off the danger, the deeper the grievance becomes. It may be that only the political crudity of a Pax Germanica, assisted by wise provisions for the social and economic betterment of conquered races, after the model of the Pax Romana, will suffice to overcome the grievance and, as it were, wear it out. Even so, as we have noted, conditions to-day are far from being the same as in Roman days. Moreover there appears to be no question in the mind of the British and American statesmen of any such Pax Anglo-Americana. Instead the Atlantic Charter offers the promise of all-round economic equality with temporary and not wholly effective political suzerainty over the conquered countries.

How far can we expect such economic equality—if it is feasible—to off-set the sense of grievance? Given the popular will against war and the deep popular desire for economic security above everything else, we certainly think that a square economic deal *could* offset political grievances. And here, we think, there is a certain kinship between the Papal ideal and the Anglo-American ideal, for economic security is, we believe, a condition of that moral betterment which the Pope seeks. Indeed the Pope himself has noted that "something newer, something better, something more developed, organically sounder, freer and stronger than in the past" is required. In that sense we must have a new order.

But it is of the very first importance to note that the combination of political suzerainty by unilateral disarmament with economic equality entails a terrible risk. For if the political grievance is not in fact worn down, then the economic equality must feed the material resources which one day will be mobilized behind the grievance, with the tragic result that the aggrieved peoples, however pacific, will risk war for political redress and the victors, even though more pacific still, will resort to war again as the only means of maintaining themselves against the aggressor.

Thus, while there is hope that a sufficiently far-reaching settlement of Europe's economic disequilibrium will in fact wear down the sense of grievance caused by defeat and disarmament, it is no more than a hope. And we must come in the end to the conclusion that the popular will against war can only be relied upon to make war in the future unlikely under the conditions either of a Pax Germanica or a Papal peace. In

the first case the political grievance of the conquered may never have a chance of expressing itself at all ; in the second, the seeds of a grievance may never be planted. A Pax Germanica, imposed by Hitler, would evidently be a catastrophe for us and probably for everyone else, while a Pax Germanica, imposed by Britain and America, is in practice inconceivable. Anglo-Saxon public opinion would not tolerate it. There remains then only the non-vindictive, moral, Christian peace envisaged by the Pope which offers reasonable certainty that the two conditions under which popular will supports war in modern times will not obtain.

MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE.

---

### "THE MONTH" FORWARDING SCHEME

It is with special gratitude that we wish to thank all those who have assisted the Forwarding Scheme during the past year. It has meant, we know very well, a real sacrifice. But never was a gift more appreciated—to judge from the letters we receive. We are asked continually for more and more copies; we should be most grateful for further subscriptions to enable us to send them.

Many missionaries write and say that THE MONTH is the only means they have of knowing the truth about European affairs. Particularly do French missionaries ask for it. Ashamed of their country's betrayal of its allies, they are most anxious to know what is happening to the Church they are so faithfully serving.

To certain countries publications can be sent only directly from the publishers. The Manager of THE MONTH has permission to send them. Whence the added value now of a direct subscription in favour of a missionary.

Readers who are willing to forward their "Month" to a missionary or to provide an annual subscription (14s.) for one to be sent direct to the more distant outposts are asked to communicate with The Hon. Secretary, "The Month" Forwarding Scheme, 114 Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W.1. Readers *must* enclose a stamped addressed envelope, and all names and addresses, whether of missionaries applying for "The Month," or readers providing it, *should be printed in capitals.*

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### A GRAND DUCHY UNDER THE GERMAN HEEL

THE other day I was reminded of Luxembourg by discovering an old folder containing notices and jottings. These had reference to an international congress, held in the ducal capital towards the close of July, 1936, which I attended as a more or less official delegate. The handbook still retains its courtly and slightly formal air. For it speaks of the "III<sup>me</sup> Congrès International de l'Enseignement Secondaire Catholique"—a triennial affair—which was to assemble "sous le haut patronage de Son Excellence Mgr. Phillipe, Evêque de Luxembourg." Turn over two pages and there you see an admirable *Comité d'Honneur*, beginning with three Excellencies—the Papal Nuncio, the Bishop, and the President of the Luxembourg Government—with the backing of the Finance Minister, the President of the small Parliament of 52 members, and another M. Philippe, who is described as the "premier échevin" of Luxembourg.

Memory tells me that the congress was a most successful one, well attended, with some interesting lectures and discussions, discussions that were continued afterwards on boulevard and in café, since we were lodged in the *Grand Séminaire* and left to feed—and fend for—ourselves, as we could or would, from morning till night. And the setting was so decidedly Catholic and seemed so far removed from the stress and tension of power politics. For myself there were two slight "snags": the first, that I had to squeeze my own share in the congress, together with the journey out and home, into the interval between two successive Sunday sermons: the second—rather more alarming when I realized it—that I had to prepare an address in French, to last for a short half hour, on the position of Catholic students at English universities. This meant that two long afternoons had to be devoted to literary composition. The paper appeared. It was rapidly glanced through by a French colleague, was read—and apparently understood. But I have never felt that the French Academy would have "crowned" it.

The congress was well organized. Mornings were devoted to some general problem, bearing on the relation of the Faith to higher education, with particular reference to a bridging of the gulf between so-called scientific and religious knowledge. On the first day, for example, the Abbé Leclercq, who was principal chaplain of the Belgian *Jeunesse Universitaire Catholique* (the J.U.C.), spoke of "Le Problème de la personnalité religieuse," and he was followed by Mgr. de la Serre, then Vice-Rector of the Institut Catholique of

Paris, on "La Foi catholique et les réalités d'aujourd'hui." The next morning gave us three papers on the relation of science and religion, scriptural studies being the main concern of all three speakers. The following morning—it was the Wednesday of the congress week—brought us another theme, that of the attitude of the young Catholic man and woman in face of the tendencies and problems of modern life. The young man's case was ably and sympathetically argued by a young Italian, Luigi Gedda, the president of the Youth section of Italian Catholic Action. Not to be outdone, a Belgian lady with considerable educational experience took up the cudgels on behalf of the modern young woman. I was reminded of this address and its thoroughness—to say nothing of its length—in a letter, received recently on quite another subject from a distinguished Irish Jesuit who also attended this congress. On this particular morning, it was the ladies that had it—and had it very decidedly. Finally, a fourth morning assembly was enlivened by excellent talks from Père Mersch, the author of several valuable works on the doctrine and moral implications of the Mystical Body, and from Père Charles, the eloquent professor of Missiology at the Gregorian University.

The afternoons were reserved for a series of *rappports* on the position of Catholic students in the universities of different countries. France, Poland, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Canada, Ireland, Spain, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Argentine, England, Czechoslovakia were the countries on which reports were given—sometimes briefly, sometimes at considerable length. I have quoted the countries as they appeared in the programme, running from the Monday afternoon to the Friday morning, when the congress concluded with a civic reception in the Hôtel de Ville. It is significant that Germany and Italy were not represented.

Luxembourg was incidentally an ideal city—and duchy—for such a conference. To begin with, it was outside the obviously national countries. It was neither French nor German. Of course, the language used was French but that was a mark of civilization. I must say that I was hoping personally that the various *rappports*—of which I was to deliver one—would be tolerated in some other well recognized European tongue. That would have spared two lengthy afternoons of pen-pushing on a seminary table. But what could one do when representatives of Holland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia had wrestled gallantly with the main language of the congress?

We were away from national feeling and prejudice. As soon as you crossed the frontier, you sensed that you had been translated somehow out of the rude conflicts of this highly nationalistic world. You became international, in the proper meaning of that much-abused word. Luxembourg is very like Switzerland: it is a land where languages and cultures meet. It is perhaps significant that the fourth of these educational congresses did assemble in Fribourg

just before the war : and—if I might add a personal note—I was invited and expected to produce another *rapport* for the Fribourg gathering. Unfortunately it had to assemble under the thickening clouds of war. The meetings were held. That is all. May we hope that, when the war is over and Europe shall have recovered its position as a centre of free Catholic thought and discussion, that the fifth congress will be organized, with even greater success than before !

The meetings of the 1936 congress were held in the Hôtel de Ville or in the large hall of another building in the main square. Somehow all the city's life seemed to centre around that particular square. By day, it was the market place. In the evening, it became the social centre. A band in gaily fronted and coloured uniforms played in its bandstand. The Luxembourg army consisted of some 150 men, most of them apparently sentries or bandsmen. There was a romantic, almost a Ruritanian, atmosphere about the town. One felt, in the evening especially, that one had strayed into a dress rehearsal of "The Prisoner of Zenda" or "The Chocolate Soldier." And yet in days gone by, the city had been a formidable fortress—second only to Gibraltar, in the judgment of military engineers. Its fortifications were overhauled and improved by Vauban, who was military engineer-in-chief to the French king, Louis XIV. Passing from the railway station into the middle of the town, you have to cross a lengthy viaduct spanning the steep valley which girdles the inner portion of the city. You may still visit the concealed and underground defence galleries, known as the "Casemates," that provided a kind of Maginot Line in miniature and proved, in their time, far more effective than the *ligne Maginot*. From 1815 until 1867 this city-fortress was garrisoned by Prussian troops, this being a legacy of the Congress of Vienna. In 1867, however, the Powers agreed that the Prussians should retire, and this agreement was embodied in the Treaty of London. The Prussians did eventually go but not before it was arranged that the Luxembourg fortifications would be dismantled.

This Grand Duchy of Luxembourg—for that was its status prior to the Nazi invasion—is one of those interesting border regions that exist between two racial or national cultures. Most of its people (there are about 300,000 of them) speak a German patois with many additional words and expressions that have been adapted from the French. On their frontiers that adjoin France and Belgium much French is used. The country is smiling and pleasant, with hills in the South running upwards from Lorraine, and in the North undulating and wooded country that continues the Ardennes. There are valuable deposits of iron ore (this is the main reason why Germany covets Luxembourg), and several industries are well developed. The rivers flow eastwards or roughly so, emptying their waters into the Moselle.

Historically, the country was under the rule of the Counts of Luxembourg till late in the fourteenth century when it passed to the Habsburg. It was Burgundian for thirty or forty years, then reverted—as part of a marriage settlement—to the Habsburg again : it was under Spanish control for a time, commencing in 1555 : a section was later annexed by France, and the remainder allotted to the Emperor Charles VI by the Treaty of Utrecht. The French took it in 1795 and kept possession of it till Napoleon's downfall. It was the Congress of Vienna (1814-15) that made it into a Grand Duchy after giving it some extra territory from the former duchy of Bouillon. But this was not to mean full independence. For the duchy was given to the Dutch king, William I, to compensate him for certain Orange-Nassau possessions in Germany which had been confiscated by Napoleon in 1806 and were handed over by the Vienna Congress to the king of Prussia. When the Belgian provinces broke away from Holland in 1830, they wanted to take Luxembourg with them. It adjoined their frontiers, not those of Holland : and indeed, there was, and is, a Belgian district of Luxembourg, distinct from the grand duchy. In addition, Holland appeared to have no special desire to retain the duchy. In consequence, the duchy was in Belgian hands for seven or eight years. Then the Great Powers became impatient and decreed, in 1838, that it must revert to the House of Orange. And so it remained subject to Dutch authority until the death of William III, in 1890. William was succeeded, on the Dutch throne, by his daughter, Wilhelmina : in Luxembourg—owing to the operation of a Salic Law—he was followed by a near male relative, Adolphus of Nassau. Since that date, therefore, Luxembourg has enjoyed full independence : its territory and frontiers were guaranteed by the Great Powers twenty years previously.

In spite of this guarantee, to which they had subscribed, the Germans invaded and occupied the duchy in 1914. History repeated itself on May 10th, 1940. It is worth recalling that one of the Papal messages of sympathy with the invaded and outraged peoples was directed to the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg. From May 10th until August 7th the country was administered by the German military authorities. The regime was severe enough but it was not marked by those atrocities that are characteristic of direct Nazi control. This has been the general experience of the occupied countries. First have come the German military. While they remain in control, cruelty is not the law. But, as soon as that control passes into the hands of Nazi Gauleiters or police and Gestapo officials, then commence those sickening atrocities, that brutal and cunning plan to demoralize—through terror, threats and occasional bribes—the people whose country they have seized.

Luxembourg's experience was of this well-known sort. No doubt, there were fewer and less appalling acts of brutality than in Poland,

for example, or in the Balkans. But the programme is the same, even if it be on a smaller scale.

August 7th, 1940, brought the newly appointed Gauleiter. This was a certain Gustav Simon who arrived with an unwieldy retinue of officials and policemen. The Luxembourg constitution was abolished, its Parliament was dissolved ; it was forbidden to use the French language or the term "Grand Duchy." All important positions were at once taken by Germans ; the handful of native officials who were retained had to go to Germany for a course of "political" schooling. The Nazi family and penal code was introduced. Special courts were set up to deal with "political" offences: what constituted a "political" offence, it was naturally for the police or the Gestapo to decide. This notorious Gestapo established its headquarters in the Villa Pauly, a house that now enjoys the most sinister of reputations because of the torture and ill-treatment of prominent Luxemburgers that have taken place within its walls. Many high officers of the Grand Ducal household were arrested, together with a number of priests and persons from every walk of society.

The German intention in Luxembourg is obvious. It is to take over the country and make it part of the German Reich. But they would like to achieve this—not by force (at least officially and to the outward eye) but by the will of the Luxemburgers. The theory is, of course, that the inhabitants of the grand duchy are German in race and language and should therefore return, like so many prodigal children, to their Father Reich. Only unfortunate circumstances and the intrigues of other Powers have excluded them from their true Reich in the past. Consequently there exists a *Volksdeutsche Bewegung* (German Racial Movement), the task of which is to make the people conscious of their essential German-ity. At the head of this movement stands a Professor Kratzenberg, a man of German origin. As might be expected, every form of blackmail and terrorism is employed to force the Luxemburgers to join the movement. It is impossible to suggest how many genuine members there are of the *Volksdeutsche Bewegung* because the method of recruiting is that of compulsion. For instance, it was announced publicly that all members of the Luxembourg army, police and civil service had joined the movement in a body. Naturally, it was scarcely possible for individuals to make any protest ; it would have meant dismissal. A similar technique has been used to make workmen join the movement. Trade unions have been dissolved and all workmen are compelled to enter the German Labour Front if they wish to secure regular employment. But they will not be allowed to enter this Labour Front unless they have become members of the German Racial movement. Added pressure takes the form of threatening to send to Germany those workmen who steadily refuse membership of the movement. With these provisions, the membership of the

movement may well be large. But what percentage regard it as anything more than a hateful pre-condition of gaining their daily bread it is not easy to say. All the evidence suggests that the Germans are as cordially loathed and detested in the grand duchy as elsewhere in occupied Europe, from Calais to Kiev, from Copenhagen to Brindisi.

A second method of "germanizing" Luxembourg consists in the exchange of population. Hundreds of families from the duchy have been transplanted to Germany; some of them have been sent as far away as Leipzig and Stettin. More than three thousand labourers have been deported to the Reich. On the other side, German families are being settled in Luxembourg. Naturally, all industrial concerns have been taken over by Germans or work under direct German control. Some iron and steel works have been transferred to the *Hermann-Goering-Werke*: the *Deutsche Bank* has taken over the Luxembourg *Banque Internationale* and *Banque Générale*: and the main railway lines, that were formerly linked with the railways of Alsace-Lorraine, have been incorporated in the German system. The former Customs-Union with Belgium has been suppressed. Economically, the country is being absorbed into Germany.

Following their normal methods, the Nazis hope to "germanize" the Luxembourg youth. All former youth associations have been broken up and a *Volksjugend* instituted on the pattern of the German *Hitlerjugend*. In order to attract local youth, privileges are attached to membership. The school curriculum has been lightened and made easier—chiefly by the abandonment of all study in and of French. Theoretically, membership of this new youth organization is voluntary. In practice, however, as was the case in Germany from 1933 to 1936, it is made impossible for those who do not belong to it, to pass to a higher school, to qualify for admission to a university, and so study for an official or professional career.

Of the treatment of religion in Luxembourg there is not much evidence. Some priests have been arrested and interned: a number of monasteries and religious houses have been seized. But here it is not a question of gathering evidence of isolated acts of an anti-religious character. Germany clearly intends to absorb and so "germanize" Luxembourg. It will be her main purpose, therefore, to create that mentality among the young, of which there are so many evident marks in Germany itself. That mentality is fundamentally anti-Catholic (and the great majority of the people of the duchy are Catholics) and anti-Christian.

There is, however, strong evidence of resistance to these German methods and, in general, to German pressure. For the most part, it is and must be passive. There is a "Go Slow" campaign: there have been mysterious railway accidents, particularly on the short but important stretch of line between Luxembourg and Trier. On occasions this resistance will manifest itself actively. When the

German authorities decided to demolish the Great War Memorial, the people gathered in great numbers to prevent them doing this. A second and a third attempt were foiled in this popular way. Finally, special Gestapo troops had to be rushed from Trier; hundreds of arrests were made, and some supposed ringleaders were deported to the Reich.

Occasionally, there are outbreaks of the people's resentment. These take the form of improvised processions of men and women singing patriotic songs or, as on the birthday of the Grand Duchess, of wearing lockets with the duchess's portrait and the national colours. Her picture is displayed prominently in every house; and the people stick steadily to their "Bonjour" and "Bonsoir," though these greetings are now *verboten* in favour of a clumsy Hitler salute. Severe penalties are imposed for listening to B.B.C. broadcasts: but still the people listen to them. In general, it appears that the Luxemburgers are behaving in much the same way as Belgians and Dutch under the heel of the common oppressor.

This war has brought great suffering to the smaller nations of the continent. As often, it is the smaller countries that are suffering for the sins of greater nations. Modern science and industry have made it even more easy to bully and afflict your smaller national neighbour. Any new European order must include the maximum possible guarantee of security for smaller peoples like those of the Grand Duchy to live and work and develop in their own manner, freed from fear of the brute next door. The difficulty is that, before that hope of security can appear a permanent one, you will have to convert and re-educate the brute. It will be no slight task.

J.M.

---

"BLACK" MUENSTER

**T**HOUGH a Bishop's see, the capital of a province, and a university centre, the city of Münster, which somewhat unexpectedly burst into headlines through the attentions of the R.A.F., is, I have found, little known amongst those who otherwise know their Germany well. And yet it is an interesting as well as a very beautiful old town, so full of quaint nooks and corners, historical associations and original characters, that for quite a number of years its lovers have published with praiseworthy regularity a handsome illustrated magazine dealing solely with the worthies and curiosities of their beloved city, and from what I gathered on the occasion of my last visit a few weeks before the outbreak of the present war, without having nearly exhausted their subject.

To me, who knew Münster well, having spent a few weeks there every year since the famous "Accession to Power," the city was so profoundly interesting because it was the most definitely Catholic in its outlook and character of any German city I had visited in the

course of my travels. To the Nazis on that account alone its very name was anathema. To them it was "Black" Münster, and its inhabitants, far from resenting the name, seemed rather proud of it than otherwise.

Cut off from the great industrial inferno of the Ruhr by the vast cornfields and fat pastures of the Münsterland, the city has an atmosphere of quiet aloofness and an aristocratic distinction all its own. You felt it could afford to ignore the mob "sieghelling" its upstart gods in the market-places of the Third Reich. Ever so subtly and, most probably, quite unconsciously, it managed to convey that, in a demented world, it had retained its Westphalian common sense, together with its sense of eternal values.

To anyone, who, like myself, on each successive visit to Germany had noted with growing dismay the havoc wrought in an entire nation's outlook in the short span of a single year, coming back to Münster was like a return to sanity. It was the one city in Germany—or so it seemed to me—where you were able to get away for a space from red banners flaunting jazz crosses, the brown uniforms of the S.A. and the clanking jack-boots of the Black Guards. It was rarely I heard the narrow winding streets resound to the tramping feet of the Hitler Youth or the League of German Girls, or echoing to the fearsome challenge piped in shrill childish treble voices:

"Heute gehört uns Deutschland  
Und morgen die ganze Welt!"<sup>1</sup>

Some parents and pedagogues in Germany, at least, still seemed to have their own ideas about the future of the children committed to their charge. Nor did it appear that they were unduly bothered about finding every avenue closed to them when the time came for them to choose a career. Hitler might boast that the New Order would outlive its founder by a thousand years, but only a very few hundred years ago the people of Münster had heard a similar boast, and a later generation viewing the present in the light of past experience knew that time can bring many changes to many things.

High up in the Gothic embrasures of the tall steeple of St. Lambert's Church hang three great iron cages. Save for the interval required for the rebuilding of the tower, they have hung there four hundred years as a sign and a symbol of the immutability of God's law to man and of the transient nature of human ambition and of man-made creeds.

In 1534 the Anabaptists under a Dutch tailor, Jan van Leyden, and a number of local opportunists of the same persuasion anticipated Hitler's methods and, by a lightning stroke, succeeded in gaining possession of the city and in inaugurating an orgiastic reign of terror. The following year the troops of the Prince-Bishop took

<sup>1</sup> From the marching-song of the Hitler Youth:

"To-day Germany is ours,  
To-morrow the whole world."

Münster by storm and the self-styled "King of the New Jerusalem," (who in course of his brief "accession to power" had acquired a harem of sixteen wives), together with his "Chancellor" and "Prime Minister," were executed and their bodies hung in cages from St. Lambert's tower as a warning example.

The *Lambertiturm* with its three cages has been called the symbol of Münster. Perhaps there is something reminiscent of the rather slick symmetry of Cologne's twin towers that focuses the eye on its tall, fretted steeple as the traveller approaches the city rather than on the lovely ochre-tinted green-capped towers of the cathedral itself. But the symbolic element, to my mind, is embodied in the three iron cages, which serve as a somewhat grim reminder that in Münster the Faith has always triumphed in the end.

For the city and the whole surrounding countryside are rooted in an age-old Catholic tradition of a sturdy, healthy type, handed down from father to son by a prosperous race of farmers and the aristocracy of the lovely old *Wasserburgen* of grey stone and faded red brick that nestle in the lush green landscape of the Münsterland. How much this tradition persists I was reminded on reading the inscription on a tomb in one of the chapels of the Cathedral which perpetuates the pious memory of a Count von Galen who was Bishop of Münster in the seventeenth century. History repeats itself in Münster for on the following Sunday it was again a Count von Galen whom I saw occupying the episcopal throne at High Mass in the Cathedral, a man born to the purple, with a fine commanding presence and natural dignity, who has defended the rights of the Church and of his flock with the same energy and courage as Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich.<sup>1</sup>

Nowhere did the flaunting banners and propaganda stunts of the New Order seem more utterly out of place than in Münster. With its lovely old baroque houses, with their long windows and *portes-cochères* and their stone-paved forecourts guarded by gates and railings of exquisite wrought iron, it was the perfect *kleine Residenz* of a bygone age. The handsome Schloss that poor Max Friedrich, Archbishop and Prince Elector of Cologne, inherited, together with the royal residence at Bonn, as a magnificent liability from his lavish predecessor Clemens August, still gave the tone, though untenanted and rarely visited, to the aloof little city. I have wandered through its long vistas of State and private apartments as the only visitor, alone with the ghosts of the past. At least once a

<sup>1</sup> The remarkable sermons, preached in July by Bishop von Galen, have spread consternation among Nazis, and shown others that there is still a most important opposition to Nazi-ism within Germany itself. In these sermons the Bishop denounced the activities of the Gestapo, and spoke bluntly of an "unbounded hatred" of Christianity, which many Nazis wish to exterminate. The sermons are the more remarkable because in the month, when they were preached, Münster was continually raided by the R.A.F. The Bishop refers to damage done to his cathedral. Despite that, it is the Nazis, not the British, against whom his addresses are directed.

year, the Elector of Cologne, who was also Bishop of Münster, visited his Westphalian diocese for two or three months during the summer. His annual visit was the signal for the aristocracy and gentry to return to town from their country estates. In the vanguard of His Grace's personal retinue came his organist and *kapellmeister*, Christian Gottlob Neefe, leaving in charge of the organ at Bonn a promising pupil aged eleven, one "Louis van Bethoven," whom his master had recommended for the post of *vicarius* during his absence on the score of his being well qualified to fill it, and also because he was "young, well-behaved, and poor." In later years, the pupil, grown to man's estate, in his turn, no doubt, accompanied his own master and patron Max Franz, last of the Archbishop Electors and a great music-lover, on his annual visit to Münster. The banquetings and fêtes of more spacious days were by then a thing of the past, but the distinguished company that attended His Grace's receptions was regaled with many a feast of good music. The exquisite music-room of the Schloss, with its classic columns and subdued rich colour scheme, still served as reminder, when I saw it last, that the famous *Akademie* evenings of Bonn and Mergentheim were not discontinued when Max Franz visited his northern diocese, and it is but natural to assume that he would take a special and personal pride in young Beethoven's growing fame as a pianist and in his unequalled genius for improvisation.

Strangely enough, Goethe, the pagan, provides us with yet another link with Catholic Münster. The home of Princess Gallitzin was then the gathering-place of the choicest Catholic spirits of the day, chief among whom was her spiritual adviser Father Overberg, the great educational reformer and founder of the first Normal School for the training of teachers, and the famous convert Friedrich Leopold von Stolberg. Goethe spent some days in the Princess's home on his way back to Weimar. His youthful friendship with "Fritz" Stolberg had changed to cold hostility when the latter was received into the Church. But on his own showing, the poet was both moved and impressed by this, his first and only intimate contact with Catholic family life and with the gentle saintly Overberg.

In the havoc and destruction Hitler has brought on Germany, and Germany on herself, memories like these remain.

E. CODD.

Now, when we are gathered together in the church, we praise God; but when we depart each to his business, it is as if we cease to praise Him. Let a man not cease from right living, and then he is ever praising God. Thou dost cease from praising God, when thou turnest aside from justice and from all that pleaseth Him. For, if thou never turn aside from a good life, though thy tongue be silent, yet thy life crieth out, and the ear of God is open to thy heart.

St. Augustine. On Psalm 148, par. 2.

## II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

CATHOLIC WORLD : Oct., 1941. **The Key Position of Europe**, by Karl Traisner. [An interesting review of the succession-States to the old Habsburg Empire which sees their only just and lasting future in a mid-Danube federation.]

CLERGY REVIEW : Nov., 1941. **The Liturgical Cult of the Dead**, by Dom Romanus Rios, O.S.B. [A study of ancient liturgical formulae, showing how in them are blended the four elements of sorrow and burial, and the remembrance of the departed soul and of the dread judgment.]

COMMONWEAL : Sept. 26th, 1941. **The Lost Land**, by Theodore Maynard. [A chapter from a forthcoming book which points out how, although the United States was founded upon an agrarian system, American Catholicism is cast largely in an urban mould.]

DUBLIN REVIEW : Oct., 1941. **Europe and Christendom**, by Christopher Dawson. [Europe is a secularized Christendom, Mr. Dawson reminds us : it must be regarded as a living reality that is temporarily submerged by the storm of military aggression but which must re-emerge, unless our civilization and our social consciousness become completely disintegrated.]

Hibbert Journal : Oct., 1941. **End of the Balance of Power—What is to Succeed ?** by Dr. F. H. Heinemann. [A Europe built upon a balance of power is no longer possible : Europe must be unified, becoming what it once was, an economic, social, moral and intellectual unit, and forming a real European Commonwealth.]

IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD : Nov., 1941. **Youth and Youth Movements**, by R. S. Devane, S.J. [A neat summary of youth movements in democratic countries, including Czechoslovakia, Holland, Switzerland and South Africa, with special emphasis on the Boy Scout Movement.]

SIGN : Oct., 1941. **The Nazi Worship of Self**, by Louis J. A. Mercier. [Dr. Mercier points out how Europe is facing the full consequences of the gradual loss of faith in God and the development of violent faith in man.]

SWORD OF THE SPIRIT : Oct. 2nd, and 30th, 1941. **Crisis in Education**, by J. G. Sinnott, S.J. [A stimulating review of the problems of modern education with a challenge to Catholic parents.]

STUDIES : Sept., 1941. **Italian Colonial Policy and Problems**, by James Meenan. [Contains a fair and objective account of Italy's colonial ambitions and achievements, with some comment on her relations with other Great Powers.]

# REVIEWS

## 1.—PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND FREUD<sup>1</sup>

IT is by now quite certain that Sigmund Freud holds a place among the very greatest figures in the history of medicine. He had a genius for observation and description, and his published case-histories are a mine of invaluable material for both psychologists and psychiatrists : he gave new life to psychiatry and new hope to countless sufferers who before were thought to be either *malades imaginaires* or victims of incurable disorders ; and he invented methods of treatment that are used by many of those who are most hostile to his theories and doctrines. Like many innovators he has provoked violent opposition and inspired fanatical devotion. He has at last, surprisingly late, found an exponent who has studied his work impartially, with a sufficient background of sound philosophy as well as of clinical experience ; and the result is perhaps the first really scientific and constructive criticism of Freud's method and doctrine.

Dr. Roland Dalbiez, whose work is excellently translated by Mr. T. F. Lindsay and introduced by Dr. E. B. Strauss, devotes his first volume to the careful "setting forth" of Freud's views. He calls it "setting forth" because, first, while trying to be scrupulously faithful to Freud's thought, he throughout distinguishes psychoanalysis itself from the philosophical doctrines which Freud thought to underlie it or follow from it ; and, secondly, because he distinguishes, as he thinks Freud and his followers ought to have done but conspicuously failed to do, between what is proved or probable and what is asserted without any attempt at scientific proof. With these distinctions always in mind, he analyses first the psychopathology of everyday life, and then dreams ; these two chapters make clear Freud's method and the mechanisms which he thinks to be operative in the human psychism. The third chapter describes Freud's much controverted theories of sex, and is followed by three chapters which analyse what Freud has written about the neuroses and psychoses (to these latter Freud himself gave little attention, but his methods and theories have been applied to them by his followers and have profoundly influenced current conceptions and treatment of them). The seventh chapter sets forth Freud's theories about sublimation, art and religion ; and in conclusion there is a very short chapter about Freud's picture of the psychic apparatus.

The second volume, very closely reasoned and much less easy

<sup>1</sup> *Psychoanalytical Method and the Doctrine of Freud*, by Roland Dalbiez. Translated by T. F. Lindsay. London : Longmans, Green. Two vols. pp. xvi, 415 ; xii, 331. Price, 40s., 1941.

reading than the first, contains the author's criticism of Freud's system. He first examines Freud's fundamental conception of the unconscious, and shows that unless it is admitted not only psycho-analysis but all psychology is impossible ; and with regard to the level of the unconscious which is of primary importance in psycho-analysis, namely that of acquired modification of innate tendencies, he is in complete agreement with Freud. Then he goes on to the second pre-supposition of psycho-analysis, that within man's psychic life there is a plurality of forces between which conflict may arise : disturbance of balance between them is what constitutes neurosis (leaving out of account neuroses which are of organic origin and outside the scope of psycho-analysis). Dr. Dalbiez considers that Pavlov's investigation of conditioned reflexes affords conclusive proof that a neurosis may be due to interior conflict : " An instinctive urge was thrust back into the unconscious, and successfully repressed for a longer or shorter period ; then the balance was broken, the repression was held in check and the repressed returned in the form of neurotic symptoms."

The third chapter, entitled " The Methods of Exploring the Unconscious " is regarded by the author as the most important he has written, since he thinks that the most valuable part of Freud's work was the discovery of a technique by which the unconscious can be investigated : the methods are that of association which aims at de-repression and interpretation, and the symbolic method which, in spite of the popular interest it has aroused, to Freud himself was of only secondary value. Dr. Dalbiez finds much that is imperfect and illogical in Freud's exposition of his methods, but he has satisfied himself that if properly understood they can be used to give quite certain results in very many cases.

If so much is granted, the soundness and the value of psycho-analysis as a method of psychological investigation is substantially admitted. Its therapeutic value is a different matter and must be judged by results : there are enough case-histories quoted in the present work to show that ameliorations and cures have in fact been achieved by Freud and his followers.

There is no need to follow the author in his examination of Freud's theories of sex and art and morality and religion. He thinks the theory of sex, despite exaggerations and wrong conceptions, does nevertheless " contain valuable and well-grounded contributions to science " : his criticism of the famous and repulsive " polymorphous perversion " of children and substitution of " polymorphous perversibility " is excellent. For Freud as a philosopher he has no respect whatever. Freud himself set no store by philosophy, had never studied it and professed not to read it ; yet he constantly dabbled in it, and unfortunately could not judge whether he was trying to philosophize or was expounding the science of which he was the founder. His method throws no light on the nature of art

or of science or of morality or of religion, and "leaves the fundamental problems of the human soul where it found them." Yet his achievement was immense, and is all the more impressive when it is extricated from the extraneous speculations that have for so long obscured it. The two volumes of Dr. Dalbiez, if they receive the attention they deserve, should not only remove prejudice: they should open the way to more intelligent exposition and more fruitful application of Freud's methods by his own followers.

J.F.

## 2—THE NEGLECTED MICHAEL DRAYTON<sup>1</sup>

OF our national galaxy of Elizabethan and Jacobean poets Michael Drayton has remained for long comparatively un-honoured though his was a familiar name to his contemporaries. However, the recent edition of his works, so carefully prepared under the direction of the late Professor Hebel, has done much to alter this. Mr. Newdigate's biography of the poet was intended originally to form part of the fifth volume of Hebel's edition—a volume that was to contain notes, bibliography and variant readings, in addition to the life. The variant readings gathered proportion as they were collected, and the life lengthened, with the result that it was decided to publish them separately.

The decision was a fortunate one since it will have given the biography a wider public. Mr. Newdigate is sincerely to be congratulated. His work is learned, scholarly and judicious. He distinguishes scrupulously between what may be regarded as solidly established and that which can only be, at best, a happy conjecture. He is able, on certain points, to correct and enlarge the opinions of previous writers on Drayton. Naturally, the appeal of the work will be to the student of the period rather than to the casual reader. The book is too crammed with references and quotations to be read at leisure or in haste.

Drayton was born in 1563 on the Warwick side of the Leicestershire county border. For many years he was in the service of the Goodere family which was responsible for his education both at Alverstone and Coventry. That he profited greatly from this early training is evident from his works in which he shows a wide acquaintance with European literature and the old chronicles and poetry of England. It was during his period in the Goodere family that he chose Sir Henry Goodere's young daughter, Anne, as the feminine "Idea" or ideal of his verse. His sonnets addressed to her tell of uninterrupted attachment and devotion. One of them, perhaps the best known of all his poems, opens with the line:

Since ther's no helpe, Come let us kiss and part.

The illusion is a trifle spoilt when we are reminded that this

<sup>1</sup> *Michael Drayton and his Circle*, by Bernard H. Newdigate. Oxford, Basil Blackwell. Pp. xv, 239. Price, 15s. n. 1941.

sonnet was first printed in 1619, when Anne had been Lady Rainsford for more than twenty years and was a stately matron of nearly fifty. After the death of Sir Henry Goodere we find the poet in the household of Lucy Harington, afterwards Countess of Bedford and a lady of considerable importance at the court of James I. Drayton later became estranged from this literary patroness and he attributes his failure to secure James's favour, partly at least, to her loss of interest in him.

Mr. Newdigate cleverly reconstructs for us Drayton's literary and social circle. He is inclined to reject the current notion that Drayton was a close friend of Ben Jonson, though they would have mixed in the same social gatherings. Possibly he was jealous of Ben Jonson's brilliant success at the Stuart court. And, although Drayton and Shakespeare were both from Warwickshire, there is no evidence that they were friends. Mr. Newdigate suggests, following Sir Edmund Chambers and George Wyndham, that Drayton may well have been the "rival poet" of Shakespeare's sonnets: in this case, the "lovely boy" whose unwillingness to marry Shakespeare so often laments, would have been Walter Aston.

Drayton's best-known poem is "Poly-Olbion": he was fourteen years preparing the first part, that appeared in 1612, with a preface by Selden; the second portion was published ten years later. It is a long poem of 15,000 words, to the glory of his native land, not excluding Wales. He made use of many sources—among them Camden's "Britannia," Geoffrey of Monmouth, Froissart and Holinshed, Hakluyt, and even Giraldus Cambrensis—but he knew his England well, travelling widely through the country in search of local knowledge. He is all for the countryside, the woods, rivers and hamlets: he sings of the Cotswolds, Sherwood Forest, and the Vale of Clwyd. The *nouveaux riches* he frequently deplores since

idle Gentry up in such abundance sprong,  
Now pestring all this Ile. . . ;

"Unique in all literature," Mr. Newdigate writes of "Poly-Olbion," "it is a monument both of Drayton's stubborn industry and of his passionate love for his country as well in her history, legends and traditions as for the natural beauty of her hills and vales, her forests and her rivers."

One is left with the general impression that Drayton was a good, sincere and steady man. There are religious poems, to be noted at the beginning, the middle and the end of his career, suggesting that he was a devout student of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament. At each of these periods we find that friends who knew the bent of his mind—Catholics like Thomas Lodge in 1595 and John Beaumont in 1604, and Samuel Austin the evangelical in 1629—urged him to "turn divine." Several passages in the First Eclogue of "The Shepheard's Garland" bear traces of possible influence from Robert Southwell's "St. Peter's Complaynt:" though not yet

in print, Southwell's work was already circulating in manuscript.

Not a Catholic and seemingly not drawn towards Catholicism, Drayton could satirize abuses within the Church of England. He has a measure of sympathy with those in exile-for their ancient faith, and he plainly regrets the destruction of the abbeys and the material havoc wrought by the Reformation. Although he enjoyed the patronage of men and women whose families had acquired wealth and social dignity out of the spoils of the Church, he can speak with bitterness of "the new Gentry" and its selfishness and vulgarity. In the first song of "Poly-Olbion" he writes with reverent appreciation of the British and Irish saints who laboured in Cornwall: and in the twenty-fourth he mentions more than 300 saints born or working in his own country. In his "Worthies of England," Fuller says of him: "Michael Drayton . . . was a pious Poet, his conscience having always the command of his fancy, very temperate in his life, slow of speech, and inoffensive in company."

V.C.L.

### 3—ISAIAH<sup>1</sup>

EIRE has long been in labour, but she has now brought forth an Old Testament scholar of the first order. After his edition of the book of Job, Dr. Kissane has now published the first part of Isaiah, his interpretation of which is marked by the same thorough study and fine scholarship. The division which he makes between the two parts of Isaiah is the obvious one, and does not imply any special theory of authorship or sources; all that concerns the rest of the prophecy is reserved for the second part, which commands our best wishes and expectations. Since the appearance of this volume the author has been promoted to be vice-president of Maynooth; the congratulations due cannot but be mingled with a certain alarm, but it may be hoped that his new duties will leave him time and energy for a task so greatly needed as the exegesis of the Old Testament. The only really satisfactory answer to the difficulties that arise, which are neither few nor imaginary, is to be found in editions such as this of the individual books; ready-made explanations to problems arising here, there, and everywhere are seldom quite reliable. The possible reader should not be deterred by the price of the book, which is not excessive, if we consider the variety of founts used, including some Hebrew printing (which can be omitted without great loss by the unlearned), the size of the book, and the various complications due to the war; one can only be thankful that it has been found possible to publish the work at all.

<sup>1</sup>*The Book of Isaiah*, translated from a critically revised Hebrew text, with commentary, Vol. I, (cc. 1—39). By the Rev. Edward J. Kissane, D.D., L.S.S., Professor of Sacred Scripture and Oriental Languages, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth: Professor of Biblical Theology, University College, Dublin. Dublin, Browne and Nolan, Ltd. Pp. lxiv, 425. Price, 21s. n. 1941.

The arrangement of text and commentary is somewhat inconvenient, and the paper-wrapper is not attractive, but in general the volume is well got up and well bound.

"The first part of Isaiah (i-xxxix) is not a continuous composition," we are told (p. xxiii), "but a collection of distinct prophecies delivered on different occasions over a considerable period, together with various passages of introductory or editorial character. The former are in poetic form, the latter in prose. In the whole collection we may distinguish six groups or sections, viz. (a) chapters 1-5, (b) cc. 6-12, (c) cc. 13-23, (d) cc. 24-27, (e) cc. 28-35, and (f) cc. 36-39."

Most will accept this as a good account of the general contents of the book. Dr. Kissane insists strongly upon the religious character of the prophecy: Isaiah "condemned certain policies only because of their religious import" (p. xxxviii). A striking feature more or less peculiar to the prophet is his doctrine of the "remnant" of Israel which is always to be preserved: "this doctrine of the survival of a purified remnant . . . became one of the characteristic features of his teaching" (p. xlv), and was to find expression later in the epistle to the Romans. In his treatment of the text Dr. Kissane is on the whole conservative. He considers that "there is no doubt that the consonantal text has remained unchanged from the second century A.D." (p. lvi), a bold statement from which many are likely to dissent, and which indeed is not easy to reconcile with his statement a little further on, that whenever the Septuagint, the oldest Greek version, "is supported by the Targum or Vulgate or Syriac, as it often is, its claims to represent the original are very strong" (p. lix). But these other versions are considerably later than the second century A.D., and it would be rash to suppose that they were differing from a Hebrew text already established. It is also necessary to take into account the changes which our author is prepared to make upon metrical grounds.

His contribution to the metrical study of the work is in fact the most striking feature in his introduction, and is especially welcome, inasmuch as Catholics have somewhat neglected the systematic study of Hebrew metre. Here, too, he shows himself upon the whole conservative. He brings up a number of examples to show that "the poet claimed considerable freedom, and therefore emendations made solely for metrical reasons must be rejected" (p. liv). On the other hand "one form of corruption which is now recognized by many critics as of rather frequent occurrence, especially in the poetical books, is the accidental displacement of a line or a verse, or even of a longer passage. . . . Some of these misplacements may be easily detected, and have in fact been recognized as such by many critics, . . . but many others will be pointed out in the course of the commentary" (p. lvii).

What has been said may serve to indicate the general character

of the book ; the comments upon individual passages are also upon a high level of scholarship. It is to be hoped that the second volume may appear without long delay, and that other such commentaries may follow. They are likely to prove a landmark in biblical progress among English-speaking Catholics.

C.L.

#### 4—A GOSPEL FOR TO-MORROW? <sup>1</sup>

**A** WEEK or so ago an Anglican minister informed the reviewer that he considered this latest Penguin effort on a religious theme the most deplorable book he had read for years. And he was no High Churchman.

Our suspicions are aroused by a foreword on the opening page. Its facile talk about re-stating the essentials of religion is a poor introduction. We are there assured that the expression of religion (and the Christian religion is meant) "is encumbered with much that is obsolete, sophisticated and illusory." Apparently what religious thought has to do is to chase and keep up with the will of the wisp of modern thinking. We have heard this sort of thing so often : and its results—in so-called rational criticism, modernism and the general flight from definite dogma—have been disastrous. In fact, the one way to ensure that there will be mighty little gospel for to-morrow is that outlined by the Bishop of Truro.

The small book is divided into two sections, the first dealing with past and present, the second with prospects for the future. The style is chatty, scrappy and quite readable. Dr. Hunkin compresses his notion of essential Christianity into the Pauline sentence : "Through Christ we have access by one Spirit to the Father." For him it is all a question of spirit, the Spirit of Christ, God's Spirit. But nowhere is it clear what he understands by "spirit" or whether the initial letter should be a capital one. Much of what is said could bear orthodox interpretation but one feels throughout that it is scarcely intended to do so.

We are told, for instance, that the New Testament is inspiring : "so inspiring indeed is it as to invite the epithet 'inspired'" : and, if we ask by what it is inspired, the answer is "by the Spirit of Christ." But we must be careful. What the Gospels give us is "not an accurate complete account of His day-to-day words and acts." Not "complete"—that we would grant. But not "accurate." Well, what are we left with ? The Gospels—Dr. Hunkin tells us—present Christ "in the only way in which access to Him, contact with Him, is now possible. We come into contact with His Spirit. By means of our imagination ? Say that for the moment : *by means*

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel for To-morrow*. By the Bishop of Truro. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex. Pp. 94. Price, 6d. 1941.

of our imagination." But, in this view, what historical value remains to the New Testament? And Christianity is an historical religion, founded upon certain definite happenings, which are, at least in part, recorded in these scriptural documents. This talk about imagination really cuts away the historical basis of the Christian revelation.

The Bishop of Truro pays glowing tribute to the scientific and critical technique of to-day. Yet in practice he falls back upon the old-fashioned and outworn notions of the comparative religionists that had such a vogue thirty years ago. Gentile influences are made responsible for the introduction into the Christian stream of the "dramatic" element in worship, of ritual that tends towards "magic," and of that "asceticism" which Dr. Hunkin seems to dislike particularly. There is a broad hint that the Eucharist, and the Church's sacraments generally, derive from those mysterious Eleusinian mysteries (pp. 37—38). Later in the book, he deplors the presence of "absurd notions about sacrifice, notions which discredit both God and man," in the original Communion Service, as it was instituted by our Lord (p. 73).

He has a few harsh words for the moral theologians. The system of Catholic moral theology he imagines to have been built up "in the Middle Ages and earlier," and by "persons whose ideas on medical and psychological subjects were quite incorrect, and not infrequently their spiritual ideas were wrong too" (p. 67). Alas, this wretched "asceticism"! The modern man will take his troubles, not to any spiritual director, but to an expert medical psychologist. Now, no one suggests that psychological considerations do not enter into moral problems: but so also do moral principles and standards, and of these Dr. Hunkin has remarkably little to say.

He has likewise no idea of definite dogma, essentially true because it forms part of Christ's revelation and therefore retaining its validity and truth in any and every age. There is, for him, no Church that teaches with absolute authority. He would allow "the Church as a corporate body" to issue official statements but there must be regular means of revising these statements from time to time. With this background, he naturally rejects anything like ecclesiastical "persecution." It was such a pity that the "eminent Presbyter Arius" was classed as a heretic: and he ventures the opinion, based upon two recent books, the arguments of which have been answered most effectively, that Nestorius was misunderstood and was condemned for teaching "Nestorian" doctrines that he had never held. The Apostles' Creed and the Nicene Creed are useful *points de départ* for issuing a revised declaration of modern belief. The Creeds themselves may be given an honoured place in our archives. The Nicene Creed, incidentally, is said to be "strewn with watch-words of bygone controversies."

The second part of the book contains some interesting passages,

and Dr. Hunkin has at least no muddled and inconsistent views about continuity. For him the whole point of the so-called Reformation is that it was a breakaway—a breakaway that has meant both loss and gain. He has a modern version of Christ's picture of the Vine and branches. A strawberry plant will put out a sucker, which is at first a sucker and nothing more, without a root of its own. And then soon the sucker forms its own root, and, cut off from its parent, develops a full strawberry-plant life of its own. The lesson, you notice, is exactly the opposite of that taught by Christ, namely that the branch that falls away from the parent stem, must wither and die.

On the whole, we have to agree with the very adverse judgment of the Anglican minister, quoted at the beginning of this review. The book, considering the title it proclaims and the highly important subject with which it deals, is certainly deplorable. And—what makes the situation far worse—it will probably be read by a large public. Two recent "religious" Penguins have merited high praise, namely the volumes of the Bishop of Chichester and Mr. A. C. F. Beales. It is a matter for real regret that a more definite and more orthodox volume was not added to these two—a book which would have a better claim to treat of the gospel for to-morrow. For, if men are to be brought back to Christ's gospel, this will never be through some watered-down edition of the gospel's contents to suit the changing moods and fashions of some particular age, but only through the presentation, full, sincere and well-defined, of the truth of Christ.

J.M.

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,500 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in the "Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers: Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W. 15, who also receives subscriptions (14s. per annum post free).

## SHORT NOTICES

## HISTORICAL

**P**RIOR to his departure for Moscow as special Polish ambassador Dr. Stanisław Kot delivered three lectures at Oxford which now appear under the general title of **Five Centuries of Polish Learning** (Basil Blackwell, 2s. n.). It is not clear in what language these lectures were originally given, since the present volume bears a sub-heading, "English Version by William J. Rose." The lectures are a rapid review of what has been done in Poland, in spite of the many difficulties of foreign wars and partition, for the advancement of learning and science. When one remembers how chequered Poland's history has been, the record is a remarkable one. Dr. Kot does not conceal his country's indebtedness to other peoples: to Burgundian, Dutch and Rhineland monks, to German colonists after the Tartar invasion, to the Italian universities of Bologna and Padua. One important date in this national record is that of the establishment of the University of Cracow in 1364. "Polish learning was young, and Cracow was its cradle." Till the middle of the seventeenth century there was continual progress. Mathematics, astronomy, botany, theology and law—all these flourished, at Cracow in particular. The entry of the name of Copernicus can still be seen in the "Album studiosorum" of Cracow university. Dr. Kot observes, however, that the Polish upper class, essentially a landed aristocracy, did not take very kindly to learning, and that there was a certain dislike, among the Poles, "of effort and system, above all of specialization."

Between 1648 and 1750 Poland suffered cruelly from foreign invasion. Schools disappeared, palaces and libraries were plundered. Partly under French influence in the middle eighteenth century there was an intellectual rebirth. The Piarist Father, Stanisław Konarski, and Bishop Joseph Zaluski were the leaders of a new school movement of considerable importance. Then came the partitions, and during the nineteenth century Poland was struggling to retain her nationhood against the systematic "germanization" practised in the West and the spasmodic but just as violent "muscovization" from the East. Austrian rule was no less unfriendly to Polish culture till after the defeat by Prussia in 1866, when the Habsburg were forced to seek the support of the non-German elements in the new Dual Monarchy. Austrian Poland was granted autonomy, and a School Council was formed at Lwów in 1867. At once the Polish language was restored in the middle schools, and the first steps were taken to create an educational system for all the people. It was in this now autonomous part of Polish territory that great advances were made. The University of Cracow was revived, and the number of its chairs and institutes for scientific work was greatly increased. In 1873 was instituted the Polish Academy of Sciences: there were special societies for Medical Studies (1867),

for Research in Law (1868), and for Natural Science (1874). After 1918, with the resurrection of Poland, learned societies were established at many other centres, e.g., Warsaw, Poznań, Wilno and Lublin. There was a speedy growth of libraries, archives and museums. In 1939, higher institutions of learning in Poland numbered more than twenty, with nearly four thousand professors and assistants, and some 48,000 students, more than one fourth of them being women.

Dr. Kot's account of Polish efforts on behalf of higher learning, in the face of immense difficulties, makes valuable reading. At times it becomes almost a catalogue of names, most of them unknown to the average reader : but this is inevitable, when so vast a subject is dealt with in so small a compass. And occasionally one has the feeling that Dr. Kot is catering for an English audience, when he appears to emphasize—more than he should—non-Catholic and anti-Catholic movements within Poland.

It is this country, with its long history and splendid traditions, that the Germans are trying to reduce, in the words of Governor Frank, to an intellectual desert. "The destruction of Polish science and learning"—Dr. Kot reminds us sadly—"is far more complete to-day, than it ever was during the worst years of the Partitions." The only centre of higher studies existing for Poland to-day is the newly-formed Polish School of medicine in the University of Edinburgh. This callous and deliberate attempt to deprive the Polish people of all education and learning and so to degrade them to the status of a slave-people is one of the most abominable crimes of the Nazis : it will have to be severely expiated.

#### NON-CATHOLIC.

A few months before his death John Oxenham, the well-known novelist and writer of essays, was recovering from an illness in his house on the South Downs. One sleepless night, while bombs were bursting not far away, he had a dream—a fanciful dream of what after-life might be. This dream was afterwards developed and written down by his devoted daughter. It is charmingly elaborated and is full of kindly thoughts, and there is, at least, nothing of spiritualism or so-called psychic vision about it. It is a modernized version of some wandering in Elysian fields. There is plenty of natural beauty and an atmosphere of soft dimness, with gardens of Music, Art and Books. It cannot, of course, be taken seriously : it is just the pleasant reverie of a kindly man whom it apparently consoled greatly during his last months. One is somewhat alarmed by his description of a gallery of books where "is a replica of every book ever published, from the mud tablets of ancient days, to the latest thriller published to-day." Surely—in the realms to be, we shall finally escape from Deadwood Dick and Edgar Wallace. Still it is a comfort to learn that, even in John Oxenham's other-world, bad books perish in "the challenge of the Sevenfold Beam" :

it is a pity that this beam of his does not operate in our sublunary existence. The book is entitled **Out of the Body** and is published by Messrs. Longmans at three shillings and sixpence.

The second of the "Dacre Papers," published by the Dacre Press (6d. n. each) is composed by Ashley Sampson under the title of **The Psychologist Turns to God**. Mr. Sampson reminds us that, twenty years ago, there were individuals who asserted that the new psychology had exploded religion. He shows us that, even where we should allow a certain foundation to the statements of the psychologists, it is possible to magnify a genuine piece of psychological truth into a gigantic philosophical lie. Speaking generally of the attitude a Christian should adopt, he argues that we have been far too "apologetic" in the past. "A far better, and in the end a far truer, way of defending Christianity against the assumption of some schools of psychology is by the direct attack—the attack which disarms the enemy at the outset by assuming that his contentions are true and accepting them at their value as such. For it cannot be doubted that on the *subjective* side these contentions are half the truth and that if only the psychologist would go the other half of the journey, the half which philosophers would so gladly take him, he could discern the whole truth without detracting one jot or tittle from his theory." The arguments of psychology, the author contends, are arguments for the existence of God—once we allow the elementary principle that a rational universe could be created only by a reasoning power.

#### PROBLEMS OF TO-DAY.

Among the many and varied books that are being written with reference to the post-war world, attention might well be paid to a symposium of broadcast talks that now appear under the heading of **The Church Looks Ahead** (Faber and Faber, 3s. 6d. n.). The talks were given earlier in the year. They were delivered by a well-chosen group of Christian-thinking representatives, including Dr. J. H. Oldham, Maurice Reckitt, Miss Dorothy Sayers, and Father Martin D'Arcy, S.J. The book is at once interesting and important. Its general theme is given in an introduction by Mr. Mascall and Dr. Oldham. They insist that it is not a question of what man *ought to be or do*, but of what he *actually is*. The whole of our post-war reconstruction depends upon our notion of what man really is. Otherwise how are you to decide whether you should legislate for a "cog" or a "person." This is the essential consideration. Christian tradition and thought demand that man be considered, in the first place, as a "person." Among the best papers in the volume are those of Miss Sayers, Father D'Arcy, and Dr. Oldham. Miss Sayers has one statement which she cannot surely mean. She speaks of Christian dogma proclaiming no new truths. "It was not the denials of the old (pagan) religions, but

their separate fulfilment." But subsequently she insists, so rightly, that so-called "Christian ethics" cannot remain valid without Christian dogma.

#### DEVOTIONAL.

Father John Kearney, C.S.Sp., has written several simple and yet solid books of devotion. His latest and last—in view of his recent and regretted death—is entitled, **As I have Loved You** (B.O. & W. : 7s. n.). It is built up on the familiar theme : "This is My commandment that you love one another as I have loved you." The book is divided into two portions : the first dealing with God's love for us, as manifested in God's own Fatherhood and in the Incarnation ; the second, applying, in a practical manner, this supreme lesson of love to our behaviour towards one another. The style is simple and sympathetic, and each chapter is so arranged as to provide material for meditation. It is a useful book, quite in the spirit we have come to associate with its author, and can be recommended for wide use.

#### MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Among recent publications of the Catholic Truth Society the following should be noticed. **Some Arguments for the Existence of God**, in two volumes, by Father C. Donnelly, S.J., examines the mind's general approach to religion, asks what is meant by "God," and then considers the various arguments, whether metaphysical or moral, that are usually brought forward to prove that God exists. The reasoning is careful and close throughout, and the pamphlets will be found most valuable for instruction or discussion. Canon Pritchard's **Catholic Practices** has some pointed and useful comments on Catholic usages, with regard to the Sacraments and sacramentals, and concludes with some remarks that will assist a Catholic's normal practice. Father J. L. McGovern, of the Oratory, re-tells the story of **The Magdalen** and applies her lesson to the individual's spiritual life. **Lights of Home**, by Francis MacBride, continues the C.T.S. series of quiet Catholic tales, lightly told and yet seriously intended.

From the Catholic Social Guild comes a pamphlet by Father Lewis Watt, S.J., **Rerum Novarum and Social Institutions in Great Britain** (2d.). Father Watt reminds us that Leo XIII, in his apostolic letter, "Ad Anglos," praised some of the features of British social organization and approved of the British trade unions. The growth of Friendly Societies and of trade union activities is traced, as is the development of employers' associations : provision has been made, and is constantly being improved, for the protection of workers in various trades. Father Watt pays a real tribute to social improvements in this country when he claims that "it is surely striking testimony to the wisdom of 'Rerum Novarum' on the one hand and of British social policy on the other that there is such close agreement between them."





## "THE UNIVERSE"

The Leading Catholic Newspaper

merits your support.

It has faithfully and zealously served the Catholic Cause at home and abroad during the whole period of its long history 1860-1941. Its able editorials, Notes and Comments, powerful articles and unrivalled news service place it in the front rank of newspapers.

**EVERY FRIDAY 2d.**

Direct Subscriptions : 13s. Inland, or Abroad per year. Inclusive of postage.

Special terms for members of His Majesty's Forces : 10s. per year, inclusive of postage, and *pro rata* for 6 or 3 months.

Head Office :

Field House, Breams Buildings, London, E.C.4.

## THE MONTH

(Double-Number : Two Shillings net)

EDITOR : REV. JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MONTH was founded in July, 1864, to represent the point of view and the claims of the Catholic Faith, and it has continued to do so for more than seventy-seven years. The need to fight the battles of the Church in English-speaking lands—a cause to which the periodical is wholly consecrated—was never greater, and the Editor ventures to hope that the support given to his efforts may always continue and be extended.

PUBLISHERS : MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN & Co., LTD., LONDON.

Annual subscription 14s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.50), should be sent to the MANAGER, MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, LONDON, S.W.15.

## BOOK REVIEWERS IN

## The Catholic Herald

during the last three months

include

The Bishop of Pella, Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., W. J. Blyton, Gillie Potter, Rev. Francis Burdett, Donald Attwater, Wilfrid Rooke Ley, Peter Anson, Mgr. Barton Brown, Dom Bede Griffiths, O.S.B., Rev. J. Heenan, etc.

**Do not miss Regular Expert  
Literary Criticism of Books,  
Catholic and Otherwise, in  
THE CATHOLIC HERALD**

Every Friday

Price Twopence.

## NEW BURDENS TO SHARE . . .

We are all bearing new burdens these days, but the C.T.S. has a new burden which *we must share* if this great work for the Faith is not to be crippled. Several new pamphlets have already been brought out to meet the new problems arising out of the war : *more are urgently needed*. Won't YOU help by becoming a member ?

Write now for particulars :

## CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40 ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1.

"From true, living Catholicism springs a sincere concern for the common good."

## THE CHRISTIAN FRONT

... Believes that Christians should concentrate on positive, constructive measures, for the best defence of Christianity is the practice of Christianity.

... Focuses attention, through editorials and articles in each issue, on the major problems facing the Christian in the modern world : of combating the errors of liberalism ; of establishing social justice ; of defending human liberty against political or economic absolutism ; of bringing about Christian peace ; of directing youth activities into Christian channels.

Readers of THE MONTH may have a sample copy by addressing :

## THE CHRISTIAN FRONT,

Agent in England : Coldwell Ltd., 17 Red Lion Passage, London, W.C.1.

===== "WISDOM FOR WAR-TIME" =====

# THE THINGS THAT MATTER

Rev. Aloysius Roche

"These essays, dealing with the application of religion with various points of daily life, are marked by the mixture of deep spirituality and shrewd common-sense.

We hope this book of unpretentious but solid wisdom, with its sane Christian optimism, will be widely read in these times of stress. It is a tonic."

*The Tablet.*

5s. net.

# DIPLOMACY AND GOD

George Glasgow

*Christianity and its bearing on International Affairs.  
Are State Rights supreme?*

"... one of the most uncompromising books about modern politics and modern warfare that have yet appeared outside the ranks of political extremists . . . serves as a useful preliminary to a widely needed examination of conscience in a generally overlooked subject matter."

*Catholic Herald.*

7s. 6d. net.

===== LONGMANS =====

